Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 5170 .L38 1853
Lathbury, Thomas, 1798-1865.
A history of the convocation
of the Church of England

Shelf..... *Number*.....

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/historyofconvoca00lath

A

HISTORY OF THE CONVOCATION

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE YEAR 1742.

BY THE

REV. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A.

AUTHOR OF

"A HISTORY OF THE NONJURORS;" "A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH EPISCOPACY," ETC.

Second Edition,

WITH CONSIDERABLE ADDITIONS.

LONDON:

J. LESLIE, 58 GREAT QUEEN STREET,

LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

1853.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN,
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

SINCE the previous edition of this work was published, the Convocation question has excited much more attention than was formerly bestowed upon it. The original Preface, with the exception of a few lines, therefore, is allowed to remain unaltered, inasmuch as it presents a true picture of the indifference which prevailed at that time.

The various subjects connected with Convocation have been carefully re-considered by the author for the present edition. Large additions have also been made; some questions, which had not attracted much notice when the former edition was published, are fully discussed; and it is believed that the work embraces all important matters connected with the history, the proceedings, and the constitution of Convocation.

My most sincere thanks are due to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury for his kind and ready permission to examine the Mss. at Lambeth, of which considerable use has been made in this volume; also to the Vicar-general, Travers Twiss, Esq., D.C.L., for his kindness in giving me free access to the books of Convocation. To the Very Rev. the Dean of Christ Church my thanks are due for allowing me to inspect the Wake Mss. in his custody in Oxford, though I did not find it necessary to ask permission to make extracts; as considerable portions of the volumes, referring to the proceedings of Convocation, are transcripts from the books at Lambeth.

1853.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It has long struck me very forcibly, that the great majority of the clergy, as well as the lay members of the Church of England are but very imperfectly acquainted with the history and proceedings of the Convocation. Some clergymen have spoken against the revival of the meetings of Convocation in such manner as to make it evident that the subject was one of which they knew very little; while many others, with whom I have conversed, have frankly confessed that they really were ignorant of the matter. My object, therefore, has been, without pretending to more than ordinary care and diligence in the selection of materials from those sources which are open to all, to give a succinct and connected history of the proceedings of Anglican Ecclesiastical Councils from the earliest period.

In looking back upon our ecclesiastical history, there are certain divisions, which are naturally made by those who enter upon the study. Thus, in the following pages, I have first given a brief, though, I hope, a sufficiently comprehensive sketch of British councils; then of those subsequent to the arrival of Augustine, down to the period of the Norman invasion, or those of the Anglo-Saxon period. After this time a considerable change took place. The pope's power gradually advanced, notwithstanding the occasional checks interposed by some of our more spirited sovereigns. In the account, therefore, of councils, from the Norman invasion until the Reformation, the reader will be able to trace the progress of the papal usurpation.

The reign of Henry VIII. is a very important period in the history of the Church in England. I have, therefore, dwelt at some length on the acts of this reign, by which the power of the pope was broken down, and which paved the way for the Refor-

mation under King Edward. The particulars, too, respecting the Act of Submission—that act which changed the character of English councils, and by which the Convocation is still regulated —are detailed with considerable minuteness. At this stage, inasmuch as no change has since been made, the constitution and powers of the Convocation are stated.

Subsequent to this reign, the history of the Convocation embraces almost the entire history of the Church, since all the principal matters were considered and settled in that assembly. Every important circumstance in our ecclesiastical history, therefore, will be noticed in this volume, especially those which have any connexion with our formularies, and the canons by which the Anglican Church is governed. I refer the reader especially to the account of the proceedings in Convocation in 1603 on the canons, and to those of 1661 on the Book of Common Prayer.

After the Revolution a scene of a different description is opened. The harmony and unity which had usually subsisted between the two houses were interrupted; and the history of the Convocation from that period is one continued scene of contentions between the bishops and the inferior clergy. I have endeavoured to detail the events, and also to describe the points of controversy, with the strictest impartiality. To enable me to render this portion of my volume as complete as possible, I have carefully perused the greater part of the numerous tracts and volumes which were called forth by the various controversies that originated between the years 1689 and 1717, the period when the last synodical acts were performed. Few persons are aware of the number of those productions. At the same time they are necessary to a full view of the subject treated of in this volume.

In the concluding chapter I have endeavoured to shew that no valid objection can be alleged against the revival of convocational business. To this chapter I wish to direct particular attention. The revival could not be attended with danger; for though some persons might wish to innovate, the majority would be determined to preserve our Liturgy and our Articles.

Neither could the deliberations of this assembly hamper or annoy the government, even were some of the clergy inclined to adopt extreme or absurd views, since it would be always in the power of the Crown to interpose a check to their proceedings. I have shewn how many advantages would result from the meeting of Convocation; how many matters might be arranged, which cannot be settled in any other place; and I have ventured to suggest certain topics for consideration, should the Crown permit the synod to assemble.

The public mind has been awakened to a sense of the importance of extending the Church among our dense population. It is evident that the great mass of the people are sincerely attached to the Church, while it is equally evident that Dissent is in most places on the decrease. That the Church, therefore, is to be the grand means by which our population are to be rescued from ignorance, is generally admitted; and yet the Church has no opportunity of putting forth her views at this important crisis, because the Convocation is not permitted to proceed to business. I have, I trust, shewn in these pages that the measure is absolutely necessary, and also that it is perfectly safe. Nor can I believe that her Majesty's Government would refuse to advise the Crown to submit to the consideration of Convocation such matters as in their judgment might be desirable, if the bishops and clergy were to express an opinion in favour of the revival. My hope is that this volume may meet the eye of some of our prelates, and be the humble means of directing their attention to the subject. I earnestly and anxiously call upon our archbishops and bishops to take the whole question into their most serious consideration.

1842.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

A.D. 596.

PAGE

Origin of Councils — Antiquity of Anglican Church — Diocesan, Provincial, National, and General Councils — The first seven General Councils — British Councils — Troubles consequent on the coming of the Saxons — The British Church 1

CHAPTER II.

A.D. 596-1066.

Augustine — Saxons — King Ethelbert — Augustine appointed Archbishop — Questions sent to Gregory — Council or Conference with British Bishops — Synod of Whitby; Hertford; at Rome, on English affairs; Hatfield; Becanceld; Berghamsted; Osterfield; Cloveshoo; Calcuith; Finchenall; Finchall; Cloveshoo; Calcuith; Winchester; Llandaff; Greatlea; London — State of Religion prior to the Norman Conquest 19

CHAPTER III.

A.D. 1066-1330.

The Normans — Legates from Rome — Councils — Diocesan Synods — Separation of the Ecclesiastical Councils from the Civil — Anselm — Contest respecting Investitures — Legates permitted to hold Councils — Progress of the Roman power — Thomas à Becket — Councils at this time — Constitutions of Clarendon — Councils — Langton's Constitutions — Legantine Councils — Othobon's Constitutions — Transubstantiation — Winchelsy's Constitutions — Various Councils 48

CHAPTER IV.

A.D. 1330-1532.

PAGE

Canon Law — Councils in 1342, 1360 — Constitutions of Islip; of Sudbury — Councils against Wicliff and Lollardism — Synods under Archbishop Chicheley from 1415 to 1437—Convocation of York—Councils in the reign of Henry VII. — Henry VIII. — A Legantine Council — Convocation, 1523 — The King recognised as Supreme Head of the Church 82

CHAPTER V.

A.D. 1532-1534.

State of the Convocation at this time — Steps by which the submission of the Clergy was procured — The Act of Submission — Its character — Constitution of the Convocation — Power of the Archbishop—Royal and provincial writs—Premunitory clause—Powers of Convocation 105

CHAPTER VI.

A.D. 1534-1558.

Discussions in Convocation — Bidding Prayer — Cromwell — Propositions submitted to Convocation — Book of Articles — Feasts abolished—Feast of Dedication of Churches—Institution of a Christian Man — Six Articles — Bible — Primers — Edward VI. — Order of Matrimony — Order of Communion — Liturgy — Ordination Service — Second Liturgy — Articles, 1552 — Catechism — Homilies — Mary — Convocation at London; at Oxford; at London — Pole's Legantine Synod — Mary's death 123

CHAPTER VII.

A.D. 1558-1602.

Elizabeth — Cautious proceedings — Litany — Convocation — Disputation — Supremacy — Heresy — Common Prayer — Common Prayer in Scotland — Eleven Articles — Thirty-nine Articles — Proceed-

PAGE

ings in Convocation — Nowell's Catechism — Jewell's Apology — Homilies — Lessons — Admonition respecting Lessons in Second Book of Homilies — Visitation Articles, 1563 — Convocation of 1571 — Articles — Subscription — Apostolical Succession — The disputed clause in the XXth Article — Canons of this Year — Foxe's Martyrology — Reformatio Legum — Canons, 1575 — Lay Baptism — Articuli pro Clero, 1584 — Orders for the Clergy — Puritan Prayer-book — Proceedings in Convocation — Canons in 1597 — Death of the Queen 154

CHAPTER VIII.

A.D. 1602-1625.

James I. — Convocation, 1604 — Canons — Analysis of them — Bidding Prayers — Ratification of Canons — Alterations in Liturgy — Convocation, 1605 — Proceedings in province of York on the Canons — They are adopted — Their authority — Convocation, 1606 — Overall's book — Its contents — Proceedings during remainder of this reign . 202

CHAPTER IX.

A.D. 1625-1660.

Charles I. — Convocation, 1625, 1626, 1627, 1628 — Articles, 1628 — Convocation, 1640 — Its sessions — Parliament dissolved — Convocation continued — They proceed to business — New writ — Opinions of the Judges on its legality — Canons discussed — Visitations — Canons completed and confirmed — Convocation dissolved — The Canons printed — Examination of the Canons — Other business — Canons opposed — Their authority — New Parliament and Convocation — Canons condemned in Parliament — Alterations in the Book of Common Prayer during the reign of Charles I. — Charges against Laud — Irish Convocation 240

CHAPTER X.

A.D. 1660-1685.

Restoration — Heylin's Letter — Convocation meets — Occasional Services — Commission to treat of Canons — Adjournment — Book of

PAGE

Common Prayer — The province of York sends proxies — Proceedings on the Review of the Book — Review completed — Book subscribed — Sent to the Council — To Lords — To Commons — Canons of 1640 discussed — Prayer-book ordered to be printed — Act of Uniformity — Prorogation — Alterations in Liturgy — Prayer for Parliament — Situation of Communion-table — Services for certain Days — Book published — Convocation yield the right of taxing themselves — No other business during this reign . . . 278

CHAPTER XI.

A.D. 1685-1701.

James II. — State-services — King William — Ecclesiastical Commission — Proposed changes in the Liturgy — Convocation — Divisions — Address to the King — Convocation dissolved — State-services altered — The proposed changes in the Liturgy considered — Overall's Convocation-book and Sherlock — Controversy respecting the Commission — Works on both sides — Controversy respecting the powers of Convocation — Letter to a Convocation Man — Works by Wake, Hill, Atterbury — Convocation meets, 1700 — Its proceedings — Toland's book — Discussions — Counsel consulted — Prorogation — Lower House continue to sit — Convocation meets again — Discussions — Burnet's work on the Articles attacked in the Lower House — Disputes continued — Decision of the Bishops respecting Burnet's book — Convocation dissolved — Works on the Convocation Controversy 313

CHAPTER XII.

A.D. 1701-1708.

Convocation, 1701 — Disputes revived — Prorogation — Death of King William — Reflections on the disputes — Works on the subject — Controversy on Burnet's Exposition — Queen Anne — Convocation, 1702 — Controversy revived — Lower House sign a Declaration respecting Episcopacy — Their conduct examined — Lower House petition the Queen — Bishops' Reply to Declaration — Convocation, 1703 — Representation of the Lower House — Queen Anne's Bounty — Prorogation — State-services — Convocation Con-

PAGE

troversy—Wake's State—Complaints of Lower House—New Convocation, 1705—Disputes on the Address—The Queen's Letter on their Differences—Prorogation—Review of Papers presented by Lower House—Convocation, 1707—Union with Scotland—Lower House complain—Absence of the Prolocutor—Dissolution. 363

CHAPTER XIII.

A.D. 1708-1714.

Convocation, 1708—Another, 1710—Atterbury prolocutor—License for business—Queen's Letter, containing subjects—They proceed to business—Whiston's case—Powers of Convocation in cases of Heresy—Judges consulted—Eight agree that Convocation has jurisdiction in cases of Heresy—Four take an opposite view—The view of the majority adopted by the Government—Whiston's Book condemned—Condemnation not confirmed by the Crown—Topics discussed—Prorogation—Convocation meets—Lay baptism—New Parliament and Convocation, 1713—License for business—Topics—Dr. Clarke's case—A Form for the Reconciliation of Converts from Rome—Queen's Death—Books—The healing. 406

CHAPTER XIV.

A.D. 1714-1741.

George I.—Convocation assembles—License for business—Form for consecrating Churches—Various forms—Consecration of Communion-plate—Convocation adjourned—Meet in 1717—Hoadly's Preservative and Sermon—Considered in Convocation—Representation of Lower House—Prorogation—Bangorian controversy—Works—Controversies arising out of the main one—Kennet's with Nicholson—Subsequent proceedings—Suspension of synodical business—The President's right—The royal license . . . 440

CHAPTER XV.

The question of the Revival of Convocations considered—The Revival shewn to be reasonable, and for the benefit of the Church—The question of Changes in the Liturgy considered—Alterations to be

PAGE

deprecated — The attempt to change not to be apprehended — Reasons for this conclusion — Candles on Communion-table — Arrangement of services — Example of the Civil Wars — Articles — Canons — Topics suggested — Psalmody — Versions of the Psalms — Conformity — Consecration of churches — Suffragan Bishops — The Revival of Convocation — The arguments of opponents considered 480

A

HISTORY OF THE CONVOCATION

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

CHAPTER I.

A.D. 596.

Origin of Councils — Antiquity of Anglican Church — Diocesan, Provincial, National, and General Councils — The first seven General Councils — British Councils — Troubles consequent on the coming of the Saxons — The British Church.

After the Saviour's ascension to glory, it became necessary for his servants the Apostles, and those who were associated with them in their labours, to assemble together at intervals, in order to decide on the various circumstances of the Church. Necessity, therefore, originated ecclesiastical synods and councils. Thus, at a very early period a council was convened at Jerusalem, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, in which various matters were discussed: and from that time the ministers of the Church, to whom the power of ecclesiastical government was intrusted by the Saviour, have had their assemblies or councils for the management of those important concerns which were committed to their superintendence. The first council was, as we have seen, held in Jerusalem; for this was the place where the Gospel was first preached, and from which the Apostles went forth to make known the

glad tidings of salvation to a ruined world. When, however, the Gospel was extended, and Churches were planted in other and distant countries, it became necessary for the ministers to meet together to conduct the affairs of the Church in their respective provinces or districts, since it was not possible to repair on all occasions to Jerusalem. At an early period Churches were planted in distant lands; and these Churches had the management of their own affairs; discipline and government, as established by the Saviour, and therefore not mutable, being the same in all.

From these remarks the origin of provincial and national councils will be seen. In the process of time, indeed, as we shall shew in the course of this history, the Church of Rome claimed a jurisdiction over all other Churches, on the ground of an alleged commission given to St. Peter, and descending from him to all the Bishops of Rome in succession, who arrogated to themselves the title and privileges of Universal Pastors; but this claim was resisted for centuries by many other Churches. Nor was it ever allowed by the whole of Christendom; and even in the Western Churches, over which at one time the Pope's power appeared to be firmly established, it was imposed against their wishes, by a combination of circumstances, which will partly appear as we proceed; so that the papal jurisdiction was nothing more than a usurpation. From that usurpation the Anglican Church was delivered at the Reformation, when she resumed the management of her own affairs, in her own councils, in accordance with the primitive practice, which was opposed to any thing like a spiritual sovereignty at Rome, or even at Jerusalem or Antioch; whose claims, had such a claim been legitimate, must have been much stronger than those of the Roman Pontiff, since in one the Saviour himself preached, and at the other the name of Christian was first adopted. There are Churches also in the East, Churches established by the Apostles, over which the Bishop of Rome never exercised any authority. The Pope's power originated in an unholy

league with the Roman Emperor, who, to serve his own interests, permitted the Bishop of Rome first to claim the title of Universal Pastor, and to exercise authority over other Churches in the empire. There were, however, Churches, not within the boundaries of the empire, which were never brought into subjection, and which still exist as independent Churches, and are so many living witnesses of the fallacy of the papal claim to universal sovereignty. Attempts, indeed, were not wanting to reduce these Churches to obedience to the see of Rome; but they were fruitless. By Rome these Churches are designated Schismatics; but the name does not prove the fact. They were never in communion with Rome; consequently they are not chargeable with separation; though were such actually the case, the guilt of schism would not have been incurred, since the papal claims have no foundation either in the Word of God or in the practice of the Primitive Church.

On the ground of antiquity of foundation our own Church has as much to plead as Rome. With respect to doctrines, Rome has no claim to antiquity, for her peculiar tenets are all of modern invention, while those points in her creed which are ancient are virtually abrogated by her additions to the apostolic faith. The advocates of the papacy affirm that we received the Gospel from Rome. Were such the case, it would afford no argument for the papal supremacy in England, unless it could be proved that the doctrine was revealed in Holy Scripture. Such authority was never granted to any Church or any bishop, consequently the Pope's plea is groundless. Waiving this question for the present, we maintain, that in point of priority of establishment, the Church in Britain is more ancient than the Church of Rome. The year 44 is fixed upon by Baronius as the period of the introduction of the Gospel into Rome by St. Peter.[a] It is, however, doubtful whether St. Peter was ever at Rome,—so doubtful indeed, that the circumstance cannot be stated as a

[a] Baronius, An. 44, 59, 60, 61.

matter of fact; though had he visited that city, the Pope's claim would not have been established. Gildas states that the Gospel was introduced into Britain A.D. 39, five years prior to its introduction into Rome. Of course it is by no means easy to determine the year of its introduction, or who was the first preacher: but the difficulties are equally great with respect to Rome. We do not build any argument on the alleged fact that St. Paul preached the Gospel in Britain; but we contend, that the evidence on the point is stronger than any that can be adduced to prove that St. Peter was at Rome.[b] It is a well-ascertained fact, that the Gospel was introduced in the apostolic age, and by apostolic men. It is also certain that it was brought hither from Judea, and not from Rome; and it is probable that the latter city had not received the glad tidings when they were first promulgated on our shores. That Christianity was received from the East, and not from the West, is proved by the various differences which were found to exist between Augustine and the British bishops. It was found that the British bishops observed the Eastern and not the Roman method of keeping Easter, and that their mode of administering baptism differed from that which had been adopted by the Church of Rome.[c] The differences existed in 731, when Bede closed his history. In the year 591, before the mission of Augustine, Gregory, the then bishop of Rome, on being told that certain children from Britain were exposed to sale, did not know whether the country was Christian or pagan,—a circumstance which certainly proves that the present claim was at that time unknown.

The fact of a difference in certain rites and ceremonies

[b] Collier, i. 3, 5. The year 60 is fixed upon by some authorities for the introduction of the Gospel into England. It is almost certain that the great event took place within the period between these two dates. Lloyd's Hist. Acc. 37, 38, 39; Jewell's Defence, 11, 12; Cressy's Church History, 16, 17.

[c] Bede, l. iii. c. 25. Bede gives an account of the discussions on the subject. See also Twisden's Historical Vindication of the Church of England, p. 7.

is very remarkable. It shews undoubtedly that England was not indebted to Rome for the first introduction of the Gospel. On the principle, indeed, of priority of foundation, the Church of Rome must have yielded to the Church of Jerusalem or the Church of Antioch. The truth is, that the matter is of little consequence; but when the Romanists are continually putting forth extravagant pretensions, grounded on such sandy foundations, it becomes necessary to place such matters in their true light. At the same time it is a pleasing reflection, that the Gospel was probably preached in Britain before its sound was heard in the imperial city.

It is foreign to my purpose to enlarge upon the general history of the Church of England. The plan which I have marked out embraces the history of ecclesiastical councils; so that those subjects only will be discussed which bear either directly or indirectly on the objects contemplated in this volume. English ecclesiastical councils present, especially at the present moment, an interesting field of inquiry; and it will be my aim to treat the subject in such a manner as to render the work generally useful.

Before I proceed, however, to detail the particulars respecting British councils, a few remarks on councils in general will be necessary.

In all communities, assemblies for deliberation and consultation are necessary. The Church is a society: and, as has been remarked, she soon felt the necessity of councils or meetings for consultation on her affairs. The Gospel was soon propagated in various parts of the world; and even the inspired Apostles were glad to take counsel together. If then the Apostles of our Lord were glad to meet together, for their mutual benefit as well as for the general good, it was not to be supposed that their successors in the ministry, men uninspired, though animated with the same ardour in their Master's cause, should not need the counsel and co-operation of each other. In such a state of things did ecclesiastical councils originate.

Besides, the Lord had given authority to his Apostles to administer the affairs of the Church,—not to one Apostle in particular, or to each one individually to act independently of the rest,—but to all of them collectively for the general good.

The first Christian councils after that mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles were *diocesan*. Into the question of episcopacy I shall not enter in this work. It is sufficient to remark that the evidence of its apostolical institution is of such a character that it cannot be resisted by unprejudiced persons. The Apostles appointed bishops as their successors in the Church, to whom was committed its government and superintendence, and to whom the presbyters were to be subject in all things lawful. In all cities and important districts, bishops, with a larger or smaller jurisdiction, were fixed as soon as the Church was settled: and as they needed counsel and advice, they were accustomed to assemble their presbyters, with whom they discussed the various affairs of their dioceses. Thus the first Christian assemblies, subsequent to the death of the Apostles, were diocesan synods or councils. They consisted of the bishop of a diocese, with a certain number of presbyters, either elected by the diocesan, or chosen by the body of the clergy as their representatives. For a long period all bishops were equal in authority, since patriarchs and archbishops, to whom was intrusted the superintendence of several provinces and dioceses, were not known in the Church until the end of the third, or the commencement of the fourth century.[d] Each diocese, therefore, in early times, was independent, the bishop and his council managing its affairs, subject of course to the Word of God, and to the discipline and government established by the Apostles. The decisions of diocesan synods were obligatory on all within the boundaries of the diocese, having the force of ecclesiastical laws: nor did any other councils exist until

[d] Bingham, i. 220.

many years after the first establishment of the Christian Church.[e]

At length, when the Gospel had spread over a wide extent, and when converts were so multiplied that many dioceses were constituted, the bishops became anxious to consult their brethren of the same order for their mutual benefit. The bishops, therefore, of a certain district met together; and such assemblies were designated *provincial synods* or *councils*. They were the next in order to the diocesan synods. The Roman empire, too, was divided into provinces; and as the Church usually adopted the same divisions, the provincial synod consisted of the bishops, with perhaps some of the presbyters, of any particular province. Over such assemblies the archbishop of the province usually presided.[f] The remark will apply also to patriarchs: for as archbishops presided in the synods of their respective provinces, so patriarchs, to whom was intrusted the superintendence of perhaps several districts, with their respective archbishops and bishops, presided in those councils which were convened within their jurisdiction. Provincial synods, as well as diocesan, originated in the necessities of the Church. Many cases arose, which the bishop in his diocese did not feel competent to decide, and in such circumstances he naturally sought the aid of his brethren: and thus provincial synods became more or less frequent according to the exigencies of the times.[g]

In process of time, when the Roman empire became Christian, embracing within its vast extent the larger portion of the civilised world, and comprehending many nations, which, though subject to one head, were yet governed by tributary kings, other councils were convened, which were termed *national* councils. At length the Roman empire was broken into various parts, several independent kingdoms arising, so that the bishops and clergy in each separate country naturally met together to

[e] Kennet's Synods, 198.
[f] Bingham, i. 213, 214.
[g] Kennet, 199.

deliberate on the affairs of the Church within their own limits. Such was the origin of *national synods*. They differed from the preceding in several respects; for while the *diocesan synod* consisted of the bishop and his presbyters, and the *provincial council* was composed of all the bishops in a particular province, under the presidency of the patriarch or the archbishop, the *national synod* comprehended all the archbishops and bishops, with certain associated presbyters, of a particular state or country. It was still competent for the bishop to hold his *diocesan synod*, or for the archbishop to summon his *provincial council;* but it was necessary that all the archbishops and bishops in any independent state should occasionally be assembled in a *national council* to deliberate for the general good.[h]

But besides these, other councils of a still more extensive description, in which the Church Universal, scattered all over the world, was represented by its prelates, were held at intervals, as the circumstances of the Church might require. These were termed *general* or *œcumenical councils*, because the Universal Church was represented in them, and bound by their decisions.[i]

General councils were originally called by the Roman emperors, but at length the Pope claimed and exercised the power of summoning them, and presided in them by his legates. The various steps by which the Bishops of Rome arrived at that state of pre-eminence will be seen in the course of our history.[j]

The *first* general council was summoned by the Emperor Constantine, and met at Nice, A.D. 325. It was convened

[h] Kennet's Synods, 199, 200.

[i] Ibid. 200.

[j] Wake's Authority of Christian Princes, 14, 15.—"After this there is a great silence in the volumes of the Councils, in a manner for the space of 200 years, until the year 1180, or thereabouts, when the Council of Lateran was held; and then indeed the case was altered. By this time had the Bishop of Rome, by his skill and practice, got one of the trumpets away, and carried it with him to Rome; so leaving princes but one: but so long they held it." Andrews *concerning the Right, &c. of calling Assemblies*, ed. 1606, pp. 44, 45.

against Arius and his followers, who denied the divinity of the Saviour.

The *second* was held at Constantinople under the Emperor Theodosius the Elder, A.D. 381. Macedonius denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, and to oppose this heresy the council was assembled.

The *third* met at Ephesus under Theodosius the Younger, A.D. 431. It was summoned to check the opinions of Nestorius.

The *fourth* was convened by the Emperor Marcianus, A.D. 451, at Chalcedon, against certain heretics, who maintained that there was only one nature in Christ.

The *fifth* was assembled at Constantinople by the Emperor Justinian, A.D. 553, against some of the followers of Origen, who held the notion of a transmigration of souls, that the torments of hell were temporary, and that devils would at last be saved.

The *sixth* also took place at Constantinople, A.D. 680, under the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus. It was summoned for the purpose of checking the heresy of those who asserted that there was only one will in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The *seventh* was convened at Nice, A.D. 787, by the Empress Irene, her son Constantine being then a minor. This was the first council in which any erroneous practice was established. It sanctioned the use of images in churches.

These seven councils were received by the Eastern and Western Churches; but though many others were convened in subsequent ages by the Popes, yet they were never recognised by the Greek Church. In short, no other councils were strictly general, since the Eastern Church was not represented. When the empire was divided, the Popes, who had already acquired considerable power, contended that it was their privilege, as successors of St. Peter, to summon councils. This claim was resisted by the Churches in the East: and therefore the councils,

which were summoned by papal authority, during several succeeding ages, and which are designated General Councils, had no right whatever to the title, since they were composed of those only who acknowledged the papal supremacy.[k]

That the Anglican Church had her *diocesan*, *provincial*, and *national synods*, from a very early period, is a well-attested fact. The bishops assembled their presbyters in their respective dioceses; the archbishops their suffragans in their provinces; and the whole body of prelates, with some of the clergy, were occasionally called together by our Christian princes in national synods. Nor had the Pope any authority for ages in the councils of the Church of England. The Church in this country retained her independence until it was wrested from her by the power of the papal see. At the Reformation she succeeded in regaining her independence, nor has the Bishop of Rome exercised authority in England since the time of Queen Mary.

Having offered these preliminary observations respecting councils in general, I shall now proceed to give a historical narration of ecclesiastical councils in England, according to their chronological order. Diocesan synods were undoubtedly held in England, though the records of the earliest do not exist. Provincial councils, too, were probably convened long before those, the memorials of which have been preserved. In early times learning was at such a low ebb, that many events occurred of which no record was made, and which were forgotten when the generation by whom they were witnessed had passed away. The remains, however, of our early councils are not only interesting in a historical point of view, as exhibiting the independence of the Anglican Church, but they are sufficient to enable us to come to a satisfactory conclusion

[k] "The rest were of the West Church alone, and so not general. The East and West together make a general. The East and West together never met but in one of those seven for public affairs."

respecting the orthodoxy of our ancestors prior to the papal usurpation.

It is a remarkable circumstance that the first Christian king, the first sovereign who embraced the Gospel, was a native of, and reigned in, Britain; and Christianity was established in England before it was established in the Empire.

The first council, of which any record remains, was summoned, A.D. 446, at Verulam, now St. Alban's. The occasion was as follows: — Pelagius, a native of Britain, had propagated his opinions respecting the human will, which were totally at variance with Holy Scripture and the doctrines generally received in the Church. To check the errors of Pelagianism, therefore, the Council of Verulam was summoned.[l] It appears that his opinions were introduced into this country by Agricola, one of his disciples.[m] Two bishops came over to England from the Continent to manage the dispute against the advocates of the heresy, the Britons not feeling themselves competent to undertake the task. Germanus and Lupus, the two prelates who came over from Gaul, appear to have acquitted themselves with great credit. The fullest permission was conceded to the supporters of the heresy to state and defend their views. "Copiam disputandi proponendique adversariis præbuerunt, loquacitatisque garritum evomere permiserunt, qui sola nuditate verborum, diu et inaniter, audientium aures cum temporibus occuparunt."[n] Not only were the clergy present, but the people, as spectators of the debate. Thus we read, "Collecta itaque apud Verolamium synodo, immensa multitudo virorum etiam cum conjugibus et liberis illuc excitata convenerat." And again, "Aderat populus, expectabatur futurus judex, adstabant partes dispari conditione consimiles, inde divina fides, hinc humana præsumptio, inde Christus,

[l] Hody, 14.

[m] Spelman's Concilia, tom. i. 47; Collier, i. 42; Wilkins, i. 1.

[n] Bede, i. 17; Nennius, 32-35; Wilkins, i. 2; Collier, i. 42.

hinc Pelagius auctor perversa pravitatio." We are informed by Bede that the bishops convicted the advocates of the views of Pelagius of error, to the satisfaction of the assembly. "Populus arbiter vix manus continet, judicium cum clamore contestando."[o] These particulars, meagre as they are, concerning the first national ecclesiastical council in England, are highly interesting to all who feel pleasure in tracing the history of the Church from its primary establishment in the British Isles.

In the year 449 another council was held; but the records of its proceedings are even more scanty than those of the preceding. It was summoned in order that means might be devised to check the Pelagian heresy, and also that the case of King Vortigern, who had married his own daughter, might be considered and decided. It is clear, therefore, that the British Church took an active part in checking the errors which had produced such pernicious effects in many parts of the Christian world. The council acted with great boldness, for the king was condemned. "Damnatur a beato Germano et omni concilio Britonum."[p] The Pelagian heresy had been revived since the preceding council; a few active persons laboured to propagate it; and the clergy applied again to Germanus to undertake the task of refuting the disseminators of the errors.

It may appear strange that the records of these and other early British councils should be so scanty. In all probability many synods were held, of which we have no remains at all: but in forming an estimate of the state of religion in Britain at this early period, we must not forget the peculiar circumstances in which the British Church

[o] Bede, i. 17; Spelman, i. 48; Labb. et Coss. tom. iii. 1464-1465. There is some difficulty in fixing the exact year in which this Council was held. The various periods assigned by different authorities are mentioned by Spelman. Baronius has the effrontery to assert that Germanus appeared at the Council as the legate of the Bishop of Rome; An. 429, 10. Collier, i. 45; Stillingfleet, 192; Usher, 174, 175, 179.

[p] Spelman, tom. i. 49; Wilkins, i. 2; Nennius, c. 39; Hody, 14, 15; Labb. et Coss. tom. iii. 1474.

was placed. When the country was deserted by the Romans, it became exposed to the perpetual ravages of the Picts and Scots; so that the Church could not enjoy any thing like peace and prosperity. In these circumstances the Britons called in the Saxons to their aid, who soon proved to be as dangerous enemies as those whom they had expelled. Within a comparatively short period, indeed, the Saxons seized upon the territories of the Britons, whom they came to assist, and compelled them to betake themselves for shelter to the mountains of Cornwall and Wales. Such was the case with the majority; and those who remained in their own land became the subjects of their conquerors. Christianity, therefore, was professed in secret; while assemblies for worship, to say nothing of synods for deliberation, were seldom held. And although some councils were from time to time convened, as the circumstances of the Church permitted, yet the writers, who subsequently undertook to treat of the ecclesiastical affairs of Britain, being anxious to exalt the credit of the Church of Rome, either passed over such matters altogether, or touched upon them very slightly in their narratives. Such was the case with Bede, of whom, in allusion to this period, Spelman remarks, "Exiguum etiam illud quod in Ecclesia Britannorum gestum est ante adventum Augustini præterit aut omnino Beda, aut delibavit parcius."[q]

A council of the clergy and laity appears to have been held in 465, when Aurelius Ambrosius was raised to the throne in the room of Vortigern.[r] This was some years after the Saxons had been invited over; so that we may conclude that at this time the Church enjoyed a short interval of peace. The Saxons, it seems, arrived in the year 449 or 450.[s] Lands were assigned them by Vortigern, on condition of their assistance against the Picts and Scots; and for a few years comparative tranquillity was the

[q] Spelman, i. 47.

[r] Spelman, i. 60; Labb. et Coss. tom. iv. 105; Wilkins, i. 7.

[s] Collier, i. 52.

result. At length, however, quarrels ensued, which issued in wars between the Britons and the Saxons, in which the latter were usually victorious. The seven Saxon kingdoms were established at various periods, the British kings being confined to Cornwall and Wales.

During these troublous times it is by no means easy to ascertain the precise state of the British Church. A synod is mentioned early in the sixth century, probably 512. At this time two metropolitans were appointed to the sees of York and Caer-Leon, the latter being filled by Dubritius, the former by Sampson.

In 516 another council was assembled on occasion of the coronation of King Arthur. At this council Dubritius resigned his archbishopric, in consequence of the infirmities of age; and David, the king's uncle, was elevated to that dignity.[t]

Soon after another synod was assembled at Brevi in Wales, the Britons having retired from England. The Pelagian controversy still existed, and the subject was debated in this council. Some authors state, that this was the council at which Dubritius resigned the archiepiscopal see. There is much confusion, however, in the accounts of this period. The bishops, abbots, lords, and people were present.[u] Again it is stated that the synod of Brevi met A.D. 519; and that David was now appointed to succeed Dubritius, who had resigned three years before. This supposition reconciles the two accounts. Dubritius may have resigned in 516, and David may have been appointed at Brevi in 519. It was at this council that David removed his see from Caer-Leon to Menevia, now called St. David's.[v]

The synod of Victory was held A.D. 529, in which the decrees of the former council were read and confirmed by the bishops and others who were assembled. New canons

[t] Spelman, i. 60, 61; Labb. et Coss. iv. 1562; Hody, 15; Wilkins, i. 7, 8.

[u] Hody, 16; Collier, i. 58.

[v] Spelman, i. 61; Labb. et Coss. iv. 1590; Collier, i. 58; Cressy, 236-242; Stillingfleet's Origin. Brit. 357, 358; Wilkins, i. 8.

also were made for the government of the British Churches. It is said that these two synods were the rule and standard for the whole British Church, and that copies of their proceedings were transmitted to all the bishops.[w]

We now pass over a considerable interval without any notice of a national or provincial council. One is mentioned, indeed, in 555, but the place is not specified, nor does Spelman allude to any such council.[x] During the period which intervened between the retreat of the Britons into Wales, and the arrival of Augustine, the councils were held in Wales; though the Archbishops of London and York continued to reside in their respective sees long after the Saxons had taken possession of the country.

A synod was convened at Llandaff, under Oudoceus the bishop. Maurice, king of Glamorganshire, had been guilty of murder, and he was excommunicated by the council. When he solicited that he might be restored to the communion of the Church, the bishop, having imposed a penance, to which the king submitted, removed the excommunication.[y] A second synod was also summoned by the same prelate, at which King Morcant and his uncle Frioc solemnly agreed, that if either should slay the other, the survivor should yield up his dominions. Soon after Frioc was assassinated by Morcant, who, either from policy or from compunction, came to Oudoceus offering to make satisfaction. It was resolved, that it was undesirable for the king to retire from his dominions; he was therefore released from his pledge of perpetual banishment, and certain penances, to which he promised to submit, were substituted.[z] The same prelate also is said to have convened a third council at the same place, at which Guidnarth, a British prince, was excommunicated. At

[w] Hody, 17; Collier, i. 58; Rapin, i. 56; Stillingfleet's Orig. Brit. 359; Wilkins, i. 8; Wilkins considers the year uncertain.

[x] Labb. et Coss. v. 1852, App.

[y] Spelman, i. 62; Labb. et Coss. v. 828, 829; Collier, i. 59.

[z] Spelman, i. 63; Labb. et Coss. v. 829; Collier, i. 59, 60.

the end of three years he came to the bishop to solicit his restoration to the communion of the Church, when he was sent by Oudoceus to the archbishop of Brittany for a year: but returning before the expiration of the time, the bishop refused to remove the excommunication. Soon after Oudoceus died, and Guidnarth was absolved by his successor in the see of Llandaff.[a]

These were the only councils prior to the arrival of Augustine, A.D. 596. The Archbishops of London and York, who continued for a long time in their sees, notwithstanding the tyranny of the Saxons, retired at length from the persecution to their brethren in Wales. Their retirement took place A.D. 587, only nine years before the mission of Augustine.

It would be foreign to my purpose to enter into many particulars respecting the state of religion in Britain before the arrival of Augustine; but we may remark that the Church of that period was quite independent of Rome, though Romanist writers assert the contrary. In the various councils, the proceedings of which have been already detailed, there is no allusion to Rome, nor to the claims of the Romish see. In short, it is evident, not only that the British Church had never heard of such a claim, but also that it had not been put forth by Rome herself. Romanists, in order to establish the claim which they now advance, should shew that the Church of Rome always asserted it. Not the slightest traces even of the claim are to be found in the history of the British Church prior to the arrival of Augustine. Had the claim been asserted, it is not probable that it would entirely have been passed over in the narratives of those times.

[a] Spelman, i. 63, 64; Labb. et Coss. v. 830, 831. These Councils are placed by Spelman about the year 560; but it is more probable that they were held several years later, after the arrival of Augustine. Usher states that Oudoceus was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury for consecration: this circumstance would therefore fix them at a later period. Usher's Religion of Ancient Irish, ed. 1684, p. 61; Wilkins, i. 17,18.

British bishops were present at the Councils of Arles, A.D. 314; Nice, A.D. 325; Sardica, A.D. 347; and Ariminum, A.D. 359; but neither the British nor the other assembled prelates considered that the authority of the Bishop of Rome was superior to that of another bishop. Some of the canons of the Council of Arles are totally at variance with the claims of the Papal See. The words of the letter in which the decisions were communicated to the Bishop of Rome are most remarkable: "Quid decreverimus communi concilio charitati tuæ significamus, ut omnes sciant quid in futurum observare debeant."[b] Such a style could not have been adopted, if the council had considered that the Bishop of Rome had a claim to greater authority than themselves. They tell the Roman bishop that certain matters were settled, and they inform him in order that he might make them public.[c] There is nothing like submission to his authority in this communication. The same remark will apply to the other councils at which British bishops were present.[d] By the Council of Sardica, which, like the rest, was called by the emperor, the Bishop of Rome is styled *frater et consacerdos noster*.[e] In fact, the whole proceedings of those times prove that the claims of Rome were neither admitted nor advanced.[f] We may, indeed, affirm that the supremacy was an invention of later date, the consequence of ambition in the Bishops of Rome.

Subsequent to the retirement of the two archbishops into Wales, A.D. 587, the British Church was reduced to a very low state. Her spiritual fathers were removed in consequence of the Saxon persecution; but we are not to imagine that all the British Christians quitted the country. We have the most direct and unquestionable testimony,

[b] Spelman, tom. i. 40; Labb. et Coss. tom. i. 1427.

[c] Collier, i. 27, 28.

[d] Stillingfleet, 91, 98; Usher, Brit. Eccles. Hist. 105; Bar. An. 347, 5; Collier, i. 29.

[e] Labb. et Coss. tom. i.; Collier, i. 26-28; Bar. An. 314, 68; Spelman, i. 39; Usher, 1 4; Dupin, cent. iv. 24.

[f] Collier, i. 32-37; Spelman, i. 46; Fuller, 24.

that large numbers continued in the land and submitted to their Saxon invaders. By them the light of the Gospel was preserved in almost every part of the country, though, from the absence of the bishops and from the persecution of the Saxons, the visible form of a Church was not maintained. Large numbers of the Britons appear to have submitted to the West Saxons especially. Of those who yielded, not a few remained constant in the faith, preaching the Gospel to their conquerors. It appears that Offa, a Saxon of the royal blood, was converted by the instrumentality of some pious Britons.[g] Some, probably animated by a missionary spirit, remained in their own country for the express purpose of attempting the conversion of the Saxons. Though, therefore, they could not preserve the outward appearance of a Church, they kept the *faith once delivered to the saints.* They acted as leaven among their conquerors, of whom many were converted by those whom they had subdued in war. By such means the path of Augustine was made easy: for on his arrival he found many professors of the Gospel, and some even in the court of the King of Kent.[h] We have the testimony of Bede to the fact that there were seven bishops in Britain, and a large body of monks at Bangor, besides many learned men.[i]

[g] Collier, i. 63.

[h] Bede, lib. ii. cap. 2.

[i] Godwin, 37, 38, 40; Wharton's Ang. Sac. i. 187; Stillingfleet, 351; Collier, i. 63; Parker de Ant. 52, 53, 61; Inett, i. 7, 10.

CHAPTER II.

A.D. 596-1066.

Augustine — Saxons — King Ethelbert — Augustine appointed Archbishop — Questions sent to Gregory — Council or Conference with British Bishops — Synod of Whitby; Hertford; at Rome, on English affairs; Hatfield; Becanceld; Berghamsted; Osterfield; Cloveshoo; Calcuith; Finchenall; Finchall; Cloveshoo; Calcuith; Winchester; Llandaff; Greatlea; London — State of Religion prior to the Norman Conquest.

In the preceding chapter we have seen the Britons driven into Wales, and their land seized by their conquerors. We have seen the British Church, not extirpated, but so depressed, that the bishops were compelled to quit their flocks. Under these circumstances Augustine arrived on the coast of Kent. As my object is to confine myself especially to ecclesiastical councils, I shall not detail the particulars which led to Augustine's mission to England. He arrived, being sent by Gregory, bishop of Rome, A.D. 596. That both Gregory and Augustine were animated with zeal for the cause of Christ, no unprejudiced person will deny. I admit, therefore, most freely, that the prelate and the missionary were anxious for the conversion of the Saxons; but this admission is not to be construed into an approval of all the means adopted by Augustine for the furtherance of his object, much less into an acknowledgment of the claims of the Roman see to a supremacy over the Anglican Church. At this time the Bishops of Rome were disposed to push their pretensions to an unwarrantable extent, but still they had not yet claimed a supremacy over all Churches. Nay, Gregory himself actually condemned the Patriarch of Constantinople for assuming the title of Universal Bishop; so that Gregory is one of the strongest testimonies against the antiquity of the papal claim. Undoubtedly Gregory

and Augustine put forth claims which could not be substantiated; but they were not those of the Bishops of Rome of subsequent ages: they were rather grounded on the notion of a patriarchal than a pontifical power: so that a grand distinction must be made between the pretensions of Gregory and those which were advanced by his successors in later times. Even the Anglo-Saxon Church refused to yield subjection to the exorbitant demands of subsequent popes, though they were ready to acknowledge the primacy of the Romish see, or its patriarchal privileges, as explained by Augustine.

The work of evangelising the Saxons was shared between Augustine and the British Christians. I would by no means detract from the reputation of Augustine. He was an instrument of great good; but it would be unjust not to award a due share of the merit of the work to the British Christians.

"Besides the especial co-operation and blessing with which God ever accompanies the propagation of truth and holiness, there was a confluence of many outward causes in the conversion of the Saxons."[a]

"The Britons, who had escaped the fury of the Saxons, had, before the coming of Augustine, so far recovered themselves, that, under a wise and regular discipline, they had re-established their Church, and regained some part of the glory which they had lost by the conquest of the Saxons; for though God thought fit to lay his heavy hand upon them, yet He preserved such noble remains of the British Church and nation, that the marks of his mercy and goodness, in their preservation and future settlements, are no less visible than those of his anger and justice, in their punishment."[b] Other influences also existed before the coming of Augustine, such as the Saxon alliances with the Scots and Picts, who were Christians; so that the same writer observes, "It is reasonable to think that their

[a] Inett's Origines Anglicanæ, i. 7. [b] Ibid. i. 10.

neighbourhood and friendship with those people could not but give them some knowledge of the Christian religion, and do something towards preparing the way for it."[c]

Augustine was favourably received by Ethelbert, king of Kent, who had married a Christian princess, and could not be averse to the Christian faith. His queen had been permitted to make a public profession of the Gospel, one of the British churches in Canterbury having been appropriated to the use of herself and her household. Ethelbert himself embraced the Gospel some time after, and was baptised; and within a comparatively short space his example was followed by some other Saxon princes. In consequence of the retirement of the British bishops, Augustine became the head of another line. It is, however, uncertain whether Augustine was consecrated in Germany on his way to England, or at a later period by the Bishop of Arles. At all events he was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. He was also authorised to consecrate to the archbishopric of York, and twelve suffragans were to be apportioned to each province.[d]

In the year 601 Augustine submitted a series of questions to Gregory for his decision. According to Bede this was immediately after his consecration. Two individuals were sent to Rome on a special mission for that purpose.[e] Gregory returned a most explicit answer to the whole series, though I shall confine myself to those which bear more or less on the questions which I have undertaken to discuss. Augustine asked Gregory what course he was to pursue in the celebration of divine service, since one form prevailed in the Roman Church and another in the Churches of Gaul. Gregory replied, that

[c] Inett's Origines Anglicanæ, i. 14.

[d] Ibid. i. 26; Stillingfleet's Origines Brit. 366, 367; Bede, i. 25; Wilkins, i. 16. Lingard admits that Ethelbert could not have been ignorant of the Gospel previous to Augustine's arrival: "It was probably the belief of the majority of the British slaves in his dominions." Lingard's *Hist.* i. 75. Yet other Romish writers assert that all the people were pagans.

[e] Bede, lib. i. c. 27; Spelman, i. 95; Wilkins, i. 18, 19.

if Augustine discovered any thing more acceptable in another Church, he was at liberty to adopt it, and that he might use any forms which commended themselves to his own judgment.[f] How unlike the Church of Rome in later times! Where was the claim to infallibility? The *ninth* question is as follows: "In what manner shall we treat the bishops of the Gauls and Britons?" Gregory replies, that the bishops of the Gauls were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Arles; but he adds: "We commit all the bishops of the Britons to you." Gregory had no authority over the British bishops; but this claim, unreasonable as it was, dwindles into insignificance when contrasted with the pretensions of the see of Rome at a later period. "Thus much is evident," says a learned writer, "past all possibility of dispute, from the epistles of Gregory, that the pretence to an universal pastorship by a divine right was not so much as thought of at Rome in his time."[g] No charge was alleged against the British Churches respecting a departure from the faith; on the contrary, Roman Catholic writers admit that their creed was Catholic and orthodox. The admission is made by Baronius, who, however, adds that they were in a state of schism, because they did not submit to the see of Rome.[h]

Gregory, with his epistle to Augustine, sent him also the *pall*, which was a robe of wool worn by the archbishop in the celebration of mass. It was considered as an emblem of the archiepiscopal dignity, but in reality was a badge of slavery to the Romish see.[i] At least it soon began to be so regarded by the popes and their supporters.

This same year, and undoubtedly in consequence of Gregory's answers, Augustine sought an interview with the

[f] Spelman, i. 95; Wilkins, i. 19; Labb. et Coss. v. 1610, 1611; Johnson's Canons, i. an. 601; Bede, lib. i.

[g] Inett's Origines Anglicanæ, i. 27.

[h] Baron. Annal. an. 604, 55; Inett, i. 4.

[i] Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 68. For many particulars respecting the *pall*, Collier may be consulted, vol. i. 68, 69.

prelates of the British Church. It is not easy to decide how the Roman prelate managed to bring about a meeting with the British bishops; but a conference took place between the two parties. Two meetings are recorded, which may be regarded as two distinct councils, or as two sessions of the same council. The place of meeting was subsequently designated Augustine's Oak, the parties having probably assembled under a tree.[j] Though the precise spot cannot be ascertained, yet it is probable that it was in Worcestershire. It may appear singular that the British bishops should have so readily met Augustine; but it must be remembered that King Ethelbert was possessed of great influence in the country, and the Britons might not wish to excite his displeasure unnecessarily by refusing to assemble for a mutual conference. At the first meeting, which was attended by the British bishops and many learned men from their monasteries, Augustine demanded their submission to the see of Rome. Three points were especially insisted on,—first, conformity to the Roman practice in the celebration of Easter; secondly, in the ministration of baptism; thirdly, that they should unite with the Roman missionaries in preaching the Gospel to the Saxons. I shall not notice the particulars respecting the alleged miracle, but merely remark that the British bishops declined to give an answer, and requested another conference.[k]

[j] Spelman, i. 104. "In aliis nostris authoribus expresse scribitur *Augustini-ac*, et apud Cestrensem hodierna dialecto *Augustinss-oc;* sed ubinam habetur incertum est. *In confinio* (inquit Huntintonius) *Wicciorum et Occidentalium Saxonum*, id est, Wigornensium et Herefordensium. Nec hoc me expedit, ni forte villa *Ausric* in Wigorniæ margine versus Herefordiæ comitatum, quæ contracte dicitur pro *Austinsric*, id est, Augustini ditio, lucis aliquid in re dubia ferat. Et videtur locus sine dubio esse in Wigornia, nam et ipsa hæc synodus, alias ab authoribus Wigornensis dicitur." Spelman, i. 107. Stillingfleet's Orig. Brit. 367; Wilkins, i. 24, 25; Nash's Worcestershire, i. 10; Bede, ii. 2; Camden, ed. 1806, ii. 472; Collier, i. 75; Cressy's Church Hist. 304; Holinshed, 151; Fuller, ii. 60.

[k] Inett, i. 32; Spelman, i. 105. They were the Bishops of Worcester, Llandaff, Hereford, Bangor, St. Asaph, and two others of places which are unknown. Wilkins, i. 24, 25.

At the next meeting, at which seven British bishops were present, the same demands were repeated by Augustine. He told them, that though they practised many ceremonies which were different from those of the Church of Rome, he would be content with their obedience in the three points which had been previously specified. The British prelates replied, that they could not comply in either case; that they could not depart from their own customs, nor own him as their superior.[l] It is remarkable that the Archbishop of St. David's was not at the council, though all his suffragans were present. The cause of his absence has not been assigned; but Spelman with great probability suggests that he might decline attending, "ne metropoliticam suam dignitatem peregrino in provincia sua contra canones subderet metropolitano."[m]

It may be asked, why did not the British bishops yield to Augustine in points of indifference? The truth is, Augustine demanded submission as a right, and to have yielded would have been an acknowledgment of that right. He did not meet them on equal terms, nor for the purpose of a friendly arrangement of the various points at issue between them. It is easy, too, to assign a reason for their not uniting with Augustine in promoting the conversion of the Saxons. The British viewed the Saxons as usurpers; and though many individuals assisted, as has been already mentioned, in evangelising their conquerors, yet it was not to be expected that the Britons could concur in the work as a Church, since such a proceeding would have been an acknowledgment of the Saxon rule.[n] Upon the whole, therefore, we cannot but conclude that the British bishops pursued a wise and prudent course in their intercourse with the Romish missionary.

[l] Bede, lib. ii. c. 2.

[m] Spelman, i. 106.

[n] Collier, i. 77; Spelman, i. 104, 108, 109; Parker, 68-71; Bingham, iii. 28, 29, 180; Bede, ed. 1722, App. 716; Cave's Church Gov. 248-252. Baronius stigmatises the Britons as schismatics, and asserts that they were punished by the Lord; Bar. An. 604, 59, 65. Dod's Church Hist. i. 12.

A council, of which little is known, was held A.D. 605, at which certain privileges were conferred on a monastery founded by Augustine;[o] and another A.D. 617, in which the bishops, in consequence of the cruelty and apostasy of the Saxons, resolved to retire from the country.[p] It appears that some acted on this determination; but it is alleged that Laurentius was prevented by a miracle from following the example of Mellitus and Justus.[q]

The conversion of the Saxons was, however, attempted both by the Romish missionaries and by the British Christians. Little, indeed, had been accomplished by Augustine at the time of his death, A.D. 604; but subsequently many Christian ministers from Rome, and from the Britons and the Scots, were employed in the work. That the Saxons were converted by missionaries from different Churches is evident from the fact that different usages prevailed in different places.[r] Two years after Augustine's death, Boniface, the Roman bishop, assumed that title, which his predecessor Gregory had condemned; but the claim was not acknowledged by the Saxon princes. It became, therefore, the policy of the Romish adherents in England to attempt to reduce the British, and those Saxons who conformed to the usages of the British Churches, to obedience to the see of Rome. This was the policy of the Archbishops of Canterbury, as the leaders of the Romish party.[s] Laurentius, who succeeded Augustine, laboured hard to induce the British and Scottish clergy to adopt the Romish usages, especially respecting the observance of Easter.[t] The Romanists felt that the difference of rites and ceremonies would involve the condemnation of their pretensions to universal sovereignty, since the fact afforded the

[o] Spelman, i. 126, 127; Labb. et Coss. v. 1614; Wilkins, i. 28.

[p] Spelman, i. 131, 132; Labb. et Coss. v. 1662; Bede, ii. 5; Wilkins, i. 30.

[q] Cressy's Church History, 324.

[r] Soames' Anglo-Saxon Church, 69.

[s] Inett, i. 63.

[t] Spelman, i. 128.

most conclusive evidence that the Churches, from which the Britons had received the Gospel, were not subject to Rome.

The synod of Whitby was convened A.D. 664, for the purpose of bringing the British Churches to conformity with Rome. The subjects of discussion were the same as in the preceding council, namely, the Easter festival, with some other observances, but that of the *tonsure* was added to the number: "In qua acerrime contenditur de ritu celebrandi paschatis, de tonsure sacerdotum, et de aliis rebus ecclesiasticis."[u] Several bishops were present from the Romish and the British Churches. Oswy, the king of Northumberland, by whose means the council was convened, commanded Colman to explain the customs of the British Christians. This prelate stated, that he observed the same method of keeping the Easter festival as was practised by those who sent him hither as a bishop, which had been received from St. John, and handed down from their forefathers. Wilfrid was the speaker on the other side. He stated that they followed the practice of Rome, Italy, France, Greece, Asia, and Africa, and that the Britons and the Picts alone adopted a different custom.[v] Both parties having been heard, the king declared in favour of the Roman method of keeping Easter, and also of the tonsure.[w] Oswy's reason for his decision is remarkable, and shews that the progress of superstition had been rapid. It was this, that as St. Peter kept the door of heaven, he dared not contradict him, lest when he came thither the Apostle should refuse him an entrance.[x] It was not pretended, however, that the Bishop of Rome, or the Archbishop of Canterbury, had any jurisdiction or authority over the Churches in the north of England; nor is it pro-

[u] Spelman, i 145.

[v] Inett, i. 68; Johnson's Canons, an. 673, note; Collier, i. 95-7.

[w] Spelman, i. 145-150; Labb. et Coss. vi. 491-6; Inett, i. 69, 70; Wilkins, i. 37-40; Bede, iii. 25.

[x] Bede, iii. 26; Cressy, 401; Wake's Authority, 167; Collier, i. 95; Holinshed, 176; Foxe, 123, 124.

bable that, had any such claim been asserted, King Oswy would have complied so readily with the Roman customs.[y]

In consequence of these disputes, the more powerful of the Saxon sovereigns agreed to choose a proper person as Archbishop of Canterbury, who should go to Rome for consecration, and then establish the Romish discipline in England. For this purpose a native was selected; but he was suddenly removed by death. Under these circumstances Pope Vitalian selected Theodore, a Greek, for that important post, who, arriving in England the next year, soon gained the favour of the Saxon monarchs.[z] At the same time they did not recognise the papal authority. Theodore, therefore, was the first Archbishop of Canterbury to whom all England submitted.

Theodore convened a synod of several bishops and presbyters at Hertford, A.D. 673. The bishops of the East Angles, Rochester, the West Saxons, and the Mercians were present, and Wilfrid, archbishop of York, sent his proxies. The British bishops were not present. A book of canons was submitted to the synod by Theodore, whose aim was to settle the Anglican Church according to the Roman model. It is uncertain whether these canons were merely transcribed from ancient councils, or whether they were drawn up by Theodore. Some have thought that they were taken from the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, while others view them as his own productions.[a] Ten canons were selected and approved by the council. The *first* relates to the much-agitated question of Easter, and decides that the festival should be kept on the first Sunday after the full moon. The others refer to matters connected with the conduct of the clergy in general. It is observed by Wake, that the discipline of the Church

[y] Inett, i. 70.

[z] Spelman, i. 153; Inett, i. 61-73; Bede, iii. 29, iv. 1; Parker, 77, 78; Collier, i. 100.

[a] Collier, i. 101, 102; Inett, i. 77.

was settled in this synod.[b] Presbyters were present in this assembly; but their precise powers cannot be ascertained.

Baronius ascribes the calling of this council to the pope, asserting that Theodore acted as his legate. Bede, on the other hand, distinctly asserts that it was called by the archbishop.[c] It is more probable that it was summoned by authority of the Saxon princes.

Within a short space a dispute arose between Theodore and Wilfrid, bishop of York, who was banished by the king of Northumberland, as it is alleged, for refusing to submit to the canons enacted in the council, though his banishment is by some ascribed to other causes.[d] Wilfrid proceeded to Rome to submit his case to the pope, who was making arrangements for holding the *sixth* general council, summoned by the emperor to meet at Constantinople. The pope, therefore, called a synod at Rome or a consistory, consisting of the incumbents of parishes in the ancient city, who formed a sort of council, as the cardinals did in later ages. By some it has been thought that they had been summoned to Rome to receive instructions preparatory to the general council; while others have asserted that they were the bishops of the neighbouring provinces, who were always called together on extraordinary occasions.[e] The Roman pontiff stated that he had summoned the council for the purpose of taking into consideration the state of the Church in Britain. Theodore had wished to appoint several bishops in the north by dividing the see of York, which was opposed by Wilfrid. The council decided in favour of Theodore's proposal; and John, precentor of the Church of St. Peter, was the bearer of the decree to the archbishop.[f]

Two abstracts of a council at Rome are given by Spel-

[b] Wake's Authority, 167-8; Labb. et Coss. vi. 538-9; Johnson's Canons, an. 673; Spelman, i. 152; Collier, i. 102; Inett, i. 78; Wilkins, i. 41-43.

[c] Baron. Annal. an 672, 4; Bede, lib. iv. c. 5; Inett, i. 80, 81.

[d] Spelman, i. 157; Johnson's Canons, an. 680, preface.

[e] Johnson's Canons, an. 680; Inett, i. 91.

[f] Spelman, i. 157; Johnson's Canons, an. 680; Wilkins, i. 44-48.

man: and there is a question whether they were two separate councils, or two sessions of the same. "Videtur igitur neutrum exemplar integrum exhibere concilium, sed vel diversam ejusdem sessionem comprehendere: vel pro arbitrio transcribentium, alterum illud prosequi quod solummodo ad Wilfridem spectat, alterum illud solum quod totius interest Ecclesiæ Britanniæ."[g] Johnson remarks upon this: "But I am so far from being of this opinion, that I look upon them as contradictory to each other; and have inserted them as a plain instance of Romish infallibility in opposition to itself. If, as is probable, the bishops and others that sat in both assemblies were the same, this self-opposition is still more gross and shameful."[h] At this time one hundred and twenty-five bishops were assembled at Rome preparatory to the council at Constantinople; but the affairs of the English Church were considered in a council comprised of individuals from the neighbouring dioceses. Johnson supposes that as the great assembly had commenced its business, the council respecting Britain was held on a non-synodical day.[i] In both of these synods the state of the Church in England was considered. A decree was enacted in Wilfrid's favour. He was to be restored to his see, though the council had previously justified Theodore. Wilfrid was also admitted to take his seat in the council, on which account some papal writers call him a *legate* from England. The notion is, however, absurd; for so far from being a *legate* to represent the English Church at Rome, he was at enmity with Theodore and the English bishops.[j] Wilfrid hastened back to England; but Theodore disregarded the sentence of the council; a circumstance which proves that the authority of the pope was not regarded even by those who were in communion with Rome. The king of Northumberland also supported the views of Theodore; for instead of restoring Wilfrid, he cast him into prison.[k]

[g] Spelman, i. 159. [h] Johnson's Canons, an. 680. [i] Ibid.
[j] Spelman, i. 160-162; Inett, i. 98. [k] Inett, i. 102.

The Church was troubled by the heresy of the *Monothelites*, who asserted that there was only one will and operation in Christ, so that the distinction of natures was destroyed. This heresy led to the sixth general council already mentioned at Constantinople; and in order to check it in England a synod was convened, A.D. 680, at Hatfield, under Theodore, the archbishop, by the command or consent of the Saxon sovereigns. It was one of the most important councils in the early history of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Theodore and the assembled prelates declared their belief in the great doctrines of the Gospel in accordance with the decisions of the *first five* general councils, specifying for what purposes they were especially called. They also received the epistles of Ibas, and the Roman synod under Martin the First, which was summoned against the same heresy. The decisions of this council had been brought over by command of Agatho. The closing words of the synod at Hatfield are very remarkable. In allusion to the decrees and decisions of the councils previously mentioned, they observe: "Suscipimus et glorificamus Dominum nostrum Ihesum Christum, sicut isti glorificaverunt, nihil addentes vel substrahentes; et anathematizamus corde et ore quos anathematizaverunt, et quos susceperunt suscipimus."[1] Thus they settled the faith of the Church, admitting the decisions of the *first five* general councils; so that it is clear, at this period the faith of the Anglo-Saxon Church was the same as that of the Anglican Church at the present time, since we recognise and receive the decisions of the councils specified at the synod of Hatfield.[m]

Another synod was convened by Theodore, A.D. 685, near the river Alne, at Twiford, at which seven bishops were present. It was at this synod that St. Cuthbert was chosen to the episcopal office.[n]

[1] Spelman, i. 168, 169; Labb. et Coss. vi. 577, 578; Wilkins, i. 51, 52; Collier, i. 107; Inett, i. 106, 107; Bede, iv. 17.

[m] Wake's Authority, 168.

[n] Bede, l. iv. c. 25; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1874; Wilkins, i. 55, 56.

The Saxon nations were now generally converted to Christianity; and the doctrines of the Church were fixed by the council of Hatfield. Theodore died A.D. 690. About this time the Church in England became more closely connected with the State; and therefore we find the Saxon princes issuing laws which related as well to ecclesiastical as to civil matters. Of this character were the laws of Ina, king of the West Saxons, A.D. 693, eleven in number, which relate especially to the Church, and were calculated to advance her interests.[o]

In the year 692 or 694, a council met at Becanceld, Withred, king of Kent, presiding, the archbishop and his suffragans being present, besides presbyters.[p] The king declared his views respecting the Church in several points of importance. "In quo Ecclesiæ liberæ fiunt ab omni tributo et exactione seculari, earumque res a laicorum jure et injuria eximuntur." Withred's signature stands first, then the archbishop's.[q]

A council was held at Berghamstead, A.D. 696 or 697, at which the king, the archbishop and bishops, with some of the inferior clergy, and certain individuals from among the laity, were present. The decrees or decisions, twenty-eight in number, are called the *Dooms of King Withred.* By these laws the Church is exempted from the payment of taxes. Some of them also relate to the regulation of the public morals.[r]

[o] Spelman, i. 182-188; Johnson, an. 693; Wilkins, i. 58, 59; Fuller, ii. 90; Sammes's Brit. 569-578.

[p] Johnson, an. 692, who has the following note. "Now called Bapchild, near to Sittingbourn, on the Canterbury side, being about midway between the coast of Kent and London, and therefore a very convenient place for a Kentish council. At this place, not many years since, were the visible remains of two chapels, standing very near to one another, on the right hand of the road from Canterbury to Sittingbourn." Wilkins, i. 56, 57; Saxon Chron. an. 694; Wake's State of Church, 149; Collier, i. 114.

[q] Spelman, i. 189-191; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1356-1359; Collier, i. 114, 115; Wake's State, 149; Wilkins, i. 56-58; Saxon Chron. an. 694.

[r] Spelman, i. 194-198; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1376-1379; Johnson's Canons, an. 696; Wilkins, i. 60, 61; Collier, i. 114; Fuller, ii. 91.

With the exception of a few meetings or councils, the intercourse of the British bishops with the Anglo-Saxon Church had been but slight; but at the close of this century, or at the commencement of the next, Adhelm, abbot of Malmsbury, was appointed to write against the Britons on the question of the Easter festival. So great, it is said, was his success, that many submitted to the Roman method. Adhelm appears to have been selected for the task by a council.[s]

In 701 or 705 a council was assembled at Osterfield by Alfrid, king of the Northumbrians, in which Wilfrid was summoned to appear to answer to certain charges. He had declined to submit to the canons of Theodore; and on his intimation of an appeal to Rome, he was deprived by the synod of his bishopric. Wilfrid charged the council with despising the apostolic see for two-and-twenty years, while they had preferred the canons of Theodore.[t] The synod, however, declared that the see of Rome could not interfere with an Anglican council; so that, at this period, the Church in England, though connected with Rome, did not admit the papal supremacy. The king and the archbishop told Wilfrid, that his appeal to Rome had justified their decision. They proceeded, therefore, to excommunicate him and his followers. Messengers also were sent to Rome to explain their conduct to the pope. One of their charges against Wilfrid was, that he had refused to submit to the sentence of the archbishop and the synod. It was declared by the council, that their decrees could not be altered by the apostolic see.[u]

Wilfrid was received with favour at Rome, and the Pope recommended his restoration to his see. Some few years afterwards, when the feeling against him was some-

[s] Spelman, i. 199; Inett, i. 123; Wilkins, i. 66.

[t] Spelman, i. 201; Collier, i. 117; Inett, i. 134.

[u] Labb. et Coss. vi. 1382, 1384-5; Inett, i. 134, 135; Wilkins, i. 64-66; Cressy, 515.

what softened, the Archbishop of Canterbury went into Northumberland, and requested the king, Alfrid's successor, to assemble a council to decide on the case of Wilfrid. A council was accordingly assembled near the river *Nidd*, in that kingdom. The archbishop stated the wishes of the pope respecting Wilfrid's restoration; but the council replied, that they saw no reasons for reversing the decisions of Theodore. At this time, it is said, the Abbess Elfledi, King Alfrid's sister, communicated to the council, that her brother, on his dying bed, had made a vow to restore Wilfrid, in the event of his recovery from his sickness. The circumstance produced such an impression on the council, that a compromise was effected, and Wilfrid was restored.[v] Thus the persuasions of a woman were of more avail than the commands of the pope. The whole circumstances, however, related by the abbess have the appearance of an imposition. It seems to have been practised for the purpose of procuring a decision in Wilfrid's favour: yet it is clear that at this time the Anglican Church was independent of Rome.

It appears that a council was held, though the place is not known, under Ina, king of the West Saxons, in which the see of the West Saxons was divided. But it is difficult to determine any thing respecting it.[w]

A curious circumstance is recorded, connected with this period, of Egwin, bishop of Worcester. It is to this effect:—Egwin alleged that he was directed, in a vision, to set up the image of the Virgin in his cathedral. In consequence of a dispute, an appeal was made to the pope, before whom Egwin related the particulars of his vision. Constantine, the pope, sent a legate into Britain to convene a synod, which, it is stated, met at London, A.D. 712, and enacted canons in favour of the worship of images

[v] Wilkins, i. 67; Labb. vi. 1389; Collier, i. 119; Inett, i. 144; Bede, v. 20; Godwin, 562.

[w] Spelman, i. 208; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1393. Wilkins places it in 705, i. 70.

and the celibacy of the clergy. Such is an outline of the story.[x] There is, however, every reason to believe that the whole is a fabrication. It is remarkable, too, that it is rejected by some Romanists, as well as by Protestants, though on widely different grounds. By the former it is rejected on the ground that *image-worship* is of earlier date, and that it was introduced by Augustine into the Anglican Church, being the received practice; by the latter it is rejected on the ground that the evidence is insufficient and contradictory. It is rejected by Baronius and Cressy.[y]

During several years, the particulars of the Anglican synods are very scanty. But one appears to have been assembled at *Cloveshoo*, A.D. 742, at which Ethelbald, king of the Mercians, presided. At this synod the privileges of King Withred to the Church of Kent were extended to the Church of Mercia. Some writers have supposed that this was the synod of 747; but there appears to be no sufficient reason to doubt that a council was assembled in 742.[z]

At all events a most important council was convened at Cloveshoo in 747. Boniface, an Englishman, and archbishop of Mentz, as well as legate from the pope to the Germans, wrote a letter to Ethelbald, king of Mercia, in which he censures him for his immorality and for sacrilege.[a] He also addressed another letter to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, with a copy of the canons of a synod at Augsburg. The first of these canons is remarkable, as shewing the progress of Rome towards supremacy. "Decrevimus hæc in nostro synodali conventu, et confessi

[x] Spelman, i. 208-218; Wilkins, i. 71, 72.

[y] Collier, i. 122; Hody, 37; Baronius, an. 714, 3; Cressy, 539; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1421-1429. Another is supposed by some writers to have been held at Alne, an. 709, and others in 707 and 728; but very little is known respecting their proceedings. Spelman, i. 215; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1401; Collier, i. 120, 121, 155; Hody, 37; Wilkins, i. 70, 74.

[z] Spelman, i. 230, 231; Johnson, an. 742; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1532, 1533; Hody, 39; Wilkins, i. 86, 87.

[a] Wilkins, i. 87-90; Johnson, an. 747.

sumus fidem catholicam et unitatem et subjectionem Romanæ Ecclesiæ fine tenus vitæ nostræ velle servare, Sancto Petro et vicario ejus velle subjici, synodum per omnes annos congregare metropolitanos pallia ab illa sede quærere, et per omnia præcepta Sancti Petri canonice sequi desiderare, ut inter oves sibi commendatas numerentur; et istæ confessioni universi consensimus et subscripsimus."[b] It is very remarkable that such a decree should have been enacted in a provincial council before the see of Rome had put forth its absolute claim to supremacy. The *pall*, of which mention is made, was regarded by Romanists as a badge of subjection to Rome.

About this time the province of Canterbury, which hitherto had comprehended all England, was divided, according to the original intention of Gregory and Augustine. Egbert was, therefore, promoted to the see of York as a metropolitan.

King Ethelbald presided in this council at Cloveshoo. The Archbishop of Canterbury, with eleven bishops and several presbyters, were present. No less than thirty canons were framed. Many of them would be creditable to any council at any period. By the *first*, it was determined that the ancient canons should be observed; which seems to have been directed against the above-mentioned German decree. By the *tenth*, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed were commanded to be taught in the vulgar tongue. In some things the council adopted the canons of Augsburg, which had been sent by Boniface; but in the most important particulars they departed from them. "In the first and main part they desert it. I mean in this, that they profess no subjection to the pope, nor make any recognition of his sovereign authority, as they in Germany had done.."[c] The decisions were communicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury to Boniface. It is observable that

[b] Spelman, i. 232-242; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1565, 1566; Collier, i. 128, 129; Wilkins, i. 91.

[c] Johnson's Canons, an. 747; Spelman, i. 242-256; Collier, i. 129, 130.

the German council made the unity of the Church to consist in subjection to the pope; but at Cloveshoo the Anglican Church decided otherwise.[d]

After a considerable interval, a council met at Calcuith, A.D. 787. Some authorities place it in 785.[e] Hitherto the Anglican Church, as is evident from the proceedings of the council at Cloveshoo, had resisted the encroachments of the papal see; but two bishops came over from Rome at this time to be present at Calcuith, bringing with them certain canons which had been framed at Rome. They had, indeed, been subscribed previously in a Northumbrian synod, and now they were signed by Offa, king of the Mercians, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and twelve bishops, besides abbots and nobles. The bishops, who appeared as legates from the pope, affirmed that they were the first priests who had come over from Rome since Augustine. "And it were to be wished," says Johnson, "they had been the last too that came upon such an errand." He adds, "It is evident the legates had all ready drawn, and put neither the ecclesiastics nor seculars to the trouble of debating any single point. Both councils subscribe to the same form of words, which is too sad an evidence of the tame implicit faith of the Church and State at this time of day." At the same time it may be remarked that the Saxon sovereigns and bishops did not recognise the pope's claims, though they appear to have submitted to his legates, nor did the canons involve any subjection to the see of Rome. The *first* canon alone bears on the subject, and it merely enjoins the faith of the Nicene and of the six general councils. In the *tenth* these words occur, "Let bread be offered by the faithful, not crusts;" and they prove that the people brought their own bread to the communion, and consequently the notion of *transubstantiation* could not have been entertained at

[d] Inett, i. 177; Wilkins, i. 94-100.
[e] Spelman, i. 291.

that time. It was only by gradual advances that Rome succeeded in establishing her authority over the Anglican Church.[f]

Two synods are mentioned by Spelman in the year 788, at Finchenall and Acley, of which, however, little is known.[g]

Besides the archiepiscopal see of York, another was erected at Lichfield. This city was raised to that dignity by Offa, king of the Mercians, who disliked the dependence of the Church in his dominions on the see of Canterbury. He therefore procured the pall from the pope for an archbishop of Lichfield. A curious state of things existed during the Heptarchy. There were several independent kingdoms; yet all acknowledged the metropolitan power of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, until Offa procured the establishment of a third archiepiscopal see, which, however, subsisted but a short time.[h] A provincial council was convened at Verulam, A.D. 793, by Offa and his metropolitan, to decree certain honours to the memory of St. Alban, the proto-martyr of the Britons. Such was the origin of the monastery at St. Albans.[i] The next year another synod was held at Calcuith, in the kingdom of Mercia, at which several bishops, besides nobles, were present. It was convened for the same purpose as the preceding, as was also a third at the same place during the same year.[j]

In the year 798 or 799 a synod was held at Finchall, under the Archbishop of York. The Easter question was discussed, and the *first five* general councils were recog-

[f] Spelman, i. 291-302; Wilkins, i. 145-151; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1861-1873; Johnson, an. 785; Inett, i. 202, 203; Parker, 93; Saxon Chron. an. 785; Holinshed, 198, 199.

[g] Spelman, i. 304, 305; Wilkins, i. 153; Saxon Chron. an. 789.

[h] Inett, i. 199; Wilkins, i. 52.

[i] Spelman, i. 309, 310; Wilkins, i. 55.

[j] Inett, i. 313, 314; Labb. et Coss. vi. 1012; Wilkins, i. 157. Another is mentioned in 796 under Athelard the Archbishop; ibid. 158; Saxon Chron. an. 796; Johnson, an. 796.

nised, their canons and decrees being received by the synod: "Suscipimus sanctas et universales quinque synodos beatorum et Deo acceptabilium patrum, sicut præsentis libri continet textus," &c.[k] As yet, therefore, no very material change had been effected in the doctrines of the Anglican Church. Another synod appears to have assembled during the same year, at Becanceld, and another at Cloveshoo, A.D. 800.[l]

A council met at Cloveshoo in 803, at which the archbishopric of Lichfield was abolished, the bishop being reduced to a suffragan of the see of Canterbury, all the rights and privileges of the church of Canterbury being confirmed. Certain chronological difficulties existed respecting this council: but while Johnson was engaged in his laborious task of preparing his useful work for the press, a copy of the proceedings of this council was sent to him, which had been accidentally discovered in the Cottonian Library. The difficulties were now removed, since the names and circumstances which had created them did not exist in the newly-discovered manuscript. He therefore followed this copy in his translation; but he has pointed out its variations from Spelman.[m] The reasons for confirming the see of Canterbury in certain privileges were these: that the Gospel was first preached and holy baptism administered in that city by Augustine. A remarkable clause occurs in the account of the council's proceedings: "We do by consent and license of our apostolical lord, Pope Leo, forbid the charter sent from the see of Rome by Pope Adrian, and the pall, and the see archiepiscopal in the monastery of Lichfield, to be of any validity, because gotten by surreption and insincere

[k] Spelman, i. 316; Labb. et Coss. vii. 1148; Collier, i. 145; Wilkins, i. 161.

[l] Spelman, i. 317, 318; Wilkins, i. 162, 163; Labb. et Coss. vii. 1148-9, 1153; Collier, i. 145, 146; Hody, 44; Inett, 238, 239.

[m] Spelman, i. 324; Labb. et Coss. vii. 1189-90; Hody, 52; Johnson, an. 803; Collier, i. 146; Wilkins, i. 166, 167.

suggestions."[n] The see of Rome did not claim *infallibility* at that time.

A synod was assembled at Calcuith by Kenulph, the king of the Mercians, A.D. 816, at which the Archbishop of Canterbury presided. Eleven canons were framed and enacted by this council. The *second* prescribes the ceremonies for the consecration of a church; among other things, it is enjoined that the consecrated elements be laid up among the other relics, which were used on such occasions; so that the elements and the relics of saints are placed on a level. This circumstance, though it may prove that the Anglican Church had imbibed certain erroneous views respecting relics, shews that at this time our ancestors had no idea of *transubstantiation*. By the *fifth* the Scots were not permitted to exercise their ministry, on the ground that it was not known by whom they were ordained. The *tenth* ordains that prayers and alms should be offered after a bishop's death in every church; and that thirty psalms should be sung for the soul of the deceased. All prelates and abbots were recommended to sing six hundred psalms, and cause one hundred and twenty masses to be said, and set at liberty three slaves.[o]

Other councils appear to have been held about this time, of which few particulars are recorded; as one under Wulfred, archbishop of Canterbury, in 821; another at Cloveshoo, in 822, and one at the same place in 824; another in 833 at London, to devise means against the irruptions of the Danes; one in 838, and another in 851. Some of these, however, partook more of the character of parliaments than synods.[p]

[n] Cloveshoo is now called Abingdon, according to Johnson; though others state that Cliff, near Rochester, was the place.

[o] Spelman, i. 327-331; Labb. et Coss. vii. 1484-1488; Inett, i. 252-254; Collier, 149, 150; Wilkins, i. 169; Johnson, an. 816; Parker, 192; Godwin, 59.

[p] Spelman, i. 331-346; Labb. et Coss. vii. 1519, 1527, 1555-6, 1683-4, 1769; Wilkins, i. 171-181.

In the year 855 a council was held at Winchester, at which were present the kings of the West Saxons, the Mercians, and the East Angles, together with the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and their suffragans. At this council, Ethelwolf, the West Saxon monarch, made a grant of the tithe of the kingdom to the Church.[q] For several years, councils were infrequently convened, in consequence of the troubled state of the country, arising from the incursions of the Danes; nor was it until the reign of King Alfred that they were held with freedom.[r] At this period the sovereign, however, often published laws ecclesiastical—a circumstance which proves that the Saxon kings exercised a supremacy independent of the pope. Of this character were Alfred's laws, A.D. 876. In the preface, the Ten Commandments were inserted, and were thus actually made a part of the law of the land. It is remarkable, however, that the *second* commandment is suppressed, the *tenth* being divided into two to complete the number.[s]

During this troublous period several British councils were held at Llandaff, at which some of the kings were excommunicated for homicide and incest.[t] The Saxon kings were gradually reduced under the rule of the king of the West Saxons; and though some of the princes for a time retained their titles, yet they were tributary to Egbert. For some years it is difficult to trace the particulars of the ecclesiastical proceedings. Cressy mentions a council at London in 886, summoned by King Alfred, at which it is

[q] Spelman, i. 348-352; Labb. et Coss. viii. 243; Collier, i. 156, 157; Inett, i. 272-274. This could not have been the usual tithe, because it was the property of the Church before. Wilkins, i. 183-186; Selden's History of Tithes; Stephens on Tithes; Bingham, ii. 83-85; Prideaux's Original, &c. of Tithes, 152, 153, 164-198.

[r] Spelman, i. 353.

[s] Spelman, i. 354, 355; Spelman's Life of Alfred, 67, 68, 98-103; Inett, 292, 293; Cressy, 779; Foxe, 143; Fuller, ii. 120; Johnson, an. 877; Wilkins, i. 186-194.

[t] Spelman, i. 381-386; Labb. et Coss. ix. 390-396; Wilkins, i. 196-199.

said the king sharply reproved the clergy for their ignorance, and that a surprising effect was produced.[u]

At the commencement of the tenth century, it is recorded by some authors that the kingdom was placed under an interdict by the pope, because certain sees were not filled up, and that five new sees were erected by a synod which was summoned in consequence of the papal bull.[v] There is, however, strong reason to believe that the whole story is a forgery invented for the purpose of inducing the belief that the pope's power was exercised in England at this period. The council is alleged to have been held in 904 or 905, when Formosus was pope. Formosus died in 894; and Baronius, seeing the difficulty, supposes that the date 904 was substituted for 894.[w] "This only changes, but does not remove, the difficulty; for if Formosus was alive in that year, it is as certain that King Alfred was alive too, and that Edward came not to the crown till six years after; so that it is certain that Edward and Formosus were not king and pope together; but on the contrary, Formosus was dead at least four years before Edward came to the crown."[x] The truth is, the practice of placing kingdoms under interdicts was not yet known. At present, at all events, the English monarchs were supreme as well in ecclesiastical as in civil matters.

King Athelstan summoned a synod at Greatlea, A.D. 928, in which certain ecclesiastical laws were framed, which

[u] Cressy, 775; Inett, i. 263. In 905 Edward's laws ecclesiastical were framed. Wilkins, i. 202-204.

[v] Spelman, i. 387-389; Wilkins, i. 201; Collier, i. 171, 172; Johnson, an. 908; Wharton's Ang. Sac. i. 554.

[w] Baronius, an. 894, 11. Baronius gives a fearful picture of the Roman Church at this time: "Quæ tunc facies Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ? quam fœdissima, cum Romæ dominarentur potentissimæ æque ac sordidissimæ meretrices? quarum arbitrio mutarentur sedes, darentur Episcopi, et quod auditu horrendum et infandum est intruderentur in sedem Petri earum amasii pseudo-pontifices, qui non sint nisi ad consignanda tantum tempora in catalogo Romanorum Pontificum scripti." An. 912, 8. Yet at this time the clergy of the English Church were pure in their morals.

[x] Inett, i. 298; Soames' Anglo-Saxon Church, 161, 162.

are known under the name of that sovereign.[y] Four other councils are mentioned as having taken place during this period, at Exeter, Feversham, Thunderfield, and London.[z] A synod was also held in Wales in 940 or 943, at which certain laws were enacted for the regulation of the British Churches.[a] Odo, archbishop of Canterbury, published ten ecclesiastical constitutions. It was resolved, "that the Church be one in faith, hope, and charity, having one head, which is Christ." There is no allusion to the Bishop of Rome. The *ninth* canon is a condemnation of the practice of Rome at the present time: "consent to no vain superstitions, nor worship the creature more than the Creator with magical illusions."[b] The *eighth* refers to the question of unity, and in such a way as to shew that the present doctrine of the Romish Church on this subject was unknown at that time. It makes the unity of the Church to consist in unity of faith, and union with Christ the head, without any allusion whatever to a connexion with the Bishop of Rome. From the whole of those laws or regulations it is evident that the doctrines of the present Church of Rome were unknown in England in the tenth century.[c] King Edmund also summoned a synod at London, A.D. 944, at which certain ecclesiastical laws were framed, which were set forth in the king's name.[d] In the year 948 a council was convened at London, both the archbishops, with several of their suffragans, and some of the nobility, being present.[e] Two synods were held in Wales in 950 and 955; and one at London, at which the privileges of Glastonbury were

[y] Spelman, i. 396-7; Collier, i. 175; Wilkins, i. 205-7; Johnson, an. 925-6; Ang. Sac. ii. 681; Inett, i. 305-6.

[z] Spelman, i. 407; Johnson, an. 925.

[a] Spelman, i. 408-415; Wilkins, i. 208-212.

[b] Johnson, an. 943.

[c] Spelman, i. 415-418; Inett, i. 313, 314; Wilkins, i. 212-214.

[d] Spelman, i. 419-427; Labb. et Coss. ix. 612; Johnson, an. 945; Wilkins, i. 214, 215.

[e] Spelman, i. 428; Labb. et Coss. ix. 633, 634; Wilkins, i. 217, 218.

confirmed.[f] King Edgar also issued certain laws or canons A.D. 960 or 967. The thirty-eighth enjoins that some of the consecrated bread should always be ready; that care should be taken to prevent it from becoming stale; and that, should such be the case, it should be burnt.[g] Collier remarks upon this canon, "Had the English Church been of the same belief with the modern Roman as to the point of transubstantiation; had they believed the same body that was born of the blessed Virgin had been present under the appearance of bread, and that there had been flesh and bones, as the Trent Catechism words it, under so foreign a representation, 'tis hard to imagine they would have disposed of the Eucharist in this manner."[h]

Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, convened a council, A.D. 960, to consider the question of clerical celibacy. Dunstan was its powerful advocate, and the subject was discussed in several councils.[i] In 970 another met at London, in which the privileges granted to Glastonbury were confirmed, the power of conferring the pastoral staff on a brother elect being reserved to the king and his heirs. The question of celibacy was again discussed in a synod at Winchester, A.D. 975; and the legend is that, during the debate, a crucifix actually spoke in favour of Dunstan's views.[j] This is perhaps one of the earliest on record of

[f] Spelman, i. 429-435; Labb. et Coss. ix. 634, 637, 638; Wilkins, i. 222, 223. In 950 we have a body of laws under the title of *Presbyterorum Northumberensium*. The 35th is: "Si presbyter concubinam deserat et aliam accipiat, anathema sit." Spelman, i. 495-502; Wilkins, i. 218-221; Johnson, an. 950.

[g] Spelman, i. 447-476; Labb. et Coss. ix. 680-697; Wilkins, i. 225-239; Johnson, an. 960.

[h] Collier, i. 187. These Canons contain a form of confession, which, unlike the method at present in use, has no allusion to the Virgin or Saints. The penitent is to express his belief in the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity, and in the resurrection. He confesses to God and the priest; but there is no allusion to angels or saints. In the rules for fasting, the *Miserere* and *Pater noster* are enjoined; but there is no mention of the *Ave Maria*.

[i] Wilkins, i. 247-249; Spelman, 479-482.

[j] Spelman, i. 479, 483, 490-492; Labb. et Coss. ix. 698-700, 702-706, 721-723; Wilkins, i. 256, 261, 262; Lingard's Hist. i. 233.

those tricks for which the Romish Church became afterwards so celebrated; for that it was a contrivance of the monks to promote their own cause there can be no doubt whatever. To attempt the exposure of such an absurd story would be ridiculous; yet some Romish writers profess to believe it, and actually adduce it in favour of clerical celibacy. Two years after a council was held at Kirtlington, in Cambridgeshire; another at Calne, in Wiltshire, A.D. 978; and also one at Amesbury, and a British synod at Llandaff.[k]

A council was called at Aenham in 1009, probably Ensham, in Oxfordshire, by King Ethelred, with the concurrence of the two archbishops. It was a mixed assembly, as was common in those times: but almost all its proceedings related to the Church, and were managed by the clergy alone, who went apart for that purpose.[l] None of the peculiar doctrines of Rome are contained in the canons of this council except the celibacy of the clergy: so that, even at this time, there is no reason to believe that the obnoxious tenets of the Romish Church were known or received in England.[m] Soon after another synod met at Haba, whose constitutions were made public as the laws ecclesiastical of King Ethelred.[n] In 1021 a council was assembled at Winchester under King Canute; and one at Llandaff, A.D. 1034, at which Mouric, king of Glamorganshire, was excommunicated for a violation of the sanctuary of St. Dubritius.[o]

[k] Spelman, i. 493, 494, 502; Labb. et Coss. ix 724, 732; Collier, i. 199; Wilkins, i. 262-264.

[l] Wake's Authority, 159.

[m] Spelman, i. 510-530; Labb. et Coss. ix. 789-802; Johnson, an. 1009; Collier, i. 208; Wilkins, i. 285-294.

[n] Spelman, i. 530-533; Labb. et Coss. ix. 807, 808; Johnson, an. 1014; Wilkins, i. 295, 296.

[o] Spelman, i. 534, 570; Wilkins, i. 297-310. Canute published some laws ecclesiastical. He reigned from 1017 to 1036. Wilkins places the laws under the year 1033, Johnson in 1017. Wilkins, i. 299-309; Spelman, i. 539-571; Johnson, an. 1017; Foxe, 164; Howel's Synopsis, 60-63.

Between this period and the Norman Conquest, A.D. 1066, it does not appear that any English synod was assembled: and the only matters to be noticed connected with the time are the *Canons of Ælfric* and the *Laws Ecclesiastical* of Edward the Confessor. There were two Ælfrics; the one who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 994 to 1006, the other Archbishop of York from 1023 to 1051.[p]

There is some diversity of opinion respecting the date of Ælfric's productions; but they must have been published before the middle of the eleventh century. Wharton, in his learned dissertation, contended that the author was Archbishop of York. In this opinion also Spelman, at an earlier period, was inclined to concur. But Inett was influenced by the "unanimous consent of preceding times" to believe that they were the productions of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Yet in 1566, when Archbishop Parker published "The Testimonie of Antiquitie," an opinion prevailed that the writer was Archbishop of York. Another writer, Lisle, also, in the year 1638, concurs in a similar opinion. Wharton's position, that the author was Archbishop of York, and a different person from Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, is now universally admitted. Besides canons for discipline, Ælfric also translated a body of homilies into the Saxon tongue for general use. These canons and homilies certainly contain the doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church; and they are incontestable evidences against the novelties in doctrine and the pretensions of the Church of Rome. The Paschal Homily was published by Archbishop Parker. Its views are utterly opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation, as well as to the other peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome. It proves that the Romish doctrines were not then held by the Church of England.[q]

[p] Spelman, i. 572, 583, 584; Labb. et Coss. 1003-1008, 1020-1026; Johnson, an. 957; Collier, i. 204; Wilkins, i. 250-255.

[q] "A Testimonie of Antiquitie, shewing the auncient Fayth in the Church

Whether the canons were framed at the close of the *tenth* century, or at the commencement or middle of the *eleventh*, it is certain that they were the received doctrine of the Anglican Church at the period of their publication. They afford the most undoubted evidence against *transubstantiation*. The twenty-seventh canon, in allusion to the sacramental elements, which were designated *housel*, has this remarkable passage: "That *housel* is Christ's body, not corporally but spiritually; not the body in which he suffered, but that body of which he spake when he blessed bread and wine for *housel* one night before his passion, and said of the bread blessed, This is my body; and again of the wine blessed, This is my blood, that is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins."[r] This is not the doctrine of

of England touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord, here publikely preached, &c. &c. above 600 yeares agoe. Imprinted at London by John Day." It is without date, but was printed in 1566. It was republished by Lisle, together with a treatise by Ælfric on the Old and New Testaments, in 1638, under the title "Divers Ancient Monuments in the Saxon Tongue, &c." The preface was probably the production of Parker himself; Strype's Parker, i. 472; Foxe, 139-146; Collier, i. 208; Dissection of the Saxon Chronicle, 33, 68, 69, 76, 250. Soames's Anglo-Saxon Church, 232-233; Usher, 133; Hickes's Thesaurus, ii. 153; Wharton's Ang. Sac. i. 125-135. The Homilies were publicly read by the priests instead of sermons, consequently they contain the doctrines of the then Church of England. Johnson says: "I am fully persuaded that the Homilies of Ælfric are more positive against the doctrine of transubstantiation than the Homilies of the Church of England." Johnson's Preface, xx. Dupin admits that the views of Ælfric were similar to those of Bertram. Cent. x. 66. It may also be remarked that the Virgin Mary is called simply Mary in early Saxon offices, and that there is no trace of prayer being addressed to her. Hickes's Several Letters, 70. "Thus were priest and people taught to believe in the Church of England toward the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh age." Usher's Answer, ed. 1684, 57. "The leprosie of transubstantiation did not begin to spread over the body of the Church in a thousand years after Christ." Cosin's History, 126; Ang. Sac. i. 251; Dupin, cent. xii. 156.

[r] Johnson, an. 957; Inett, i. 353; Soames's Anglo-Saxon Church, 218, 219. Wilkins gives the Canons, which are considered by Spelman to be of uncertain date, under the year 994. Johnson assigns them to the same year as Ælfric's, whom, however, he makes Archbishop of Canterbury. Johnson supposes that they were translated by Ælfric. Confession is enjoined in order that spiritual advice may be obtained; but no other benefit is mentioned. "Probably,"

the present Church of Rome, but it corresponds with the views of the Church of England; so that the Anglo-Saxon Church and the Church at present are agreed on this important point. These canons, therefore, afford decisive evidence against Romanism.

With respect to the *Laws Ecclesiastical* of King Edward, it may be observed, that they furnish no evidence in favour of Rome.[s] A British synod was held at Llandaff, A.D. 1056 or 1059, which appears to have been the last council before the Norman period.[t]

It is therefore certain, that at the time of the Conquest, the faith of the Church on all important points was the same as at the present time. Thus we can fix upon certain periods in our history when the peculiar tenets of Rome were unknown; consequently they must have been the invention of later ages. It is further to be remarked, that the councils of the Anglo-Saxon times depended not on the authority of the pope but on that of the prince, without whose consent or concurrence no important matters were transacted.[u]

says Johnson, "there was no such thing as an absolution yet invented." An. 994; Spelman, i. 595-618; Wilkins, i. 265-282.

[s] Spelman, i. 619-626; Johnson, an. 1064; Wilkins, i. 310-314.

[t] Wilkins, i. 314; Spelman, i. 625, 626.

[u] Wake's Authority, 173.

CHAPTER III.

A.D. 1066-1330.

The Normans — Legates from Rome — Councils — Diocesan Synods — Separation of the Ecclesiastical Councils from the Civil — Anselm — Contest respecting Investitures — Legates permitted to hold Councils — Progress of the Roman power — Thomas à Becket — Councils at this time — Constitutions of Clarendon — Councils — Langton's Constitutions — Legantine Councils — Othobon's Constitutions — Transubstantiation — Winchelsy's Constitutions — Various Councils.

It would be foreign to the objects contemplated in this work to enter into the particulars connected with the elevation of William the Conqueror to the English throne. That he ruled with an iron hand, both the Church and the Saxons could testify. For a short time, however, every thing proceeded quietly. He was crowned by the Archbishop of York: but it is not easy to decide why the Archbishop of Canterbury was not present to perform the ceremony. In a very short space the king began to elevate Normans to the highest dignities in the Church: and as the pope had supported his pretensions to the throne, he now advanced the power of the pontiff. A scheme was concerted by which, at the request of the king, the pope was to send two legates into England.[a] This plan was devised under the show of veneration for the papal see, but in reality to promote his own objects under the shelter of papal countenance and support. "He who well knew the just boundaries of the royal power, and who through all the rest of his reign kept the court of Rome at a distance, determined for the present to take sanctuary for his oppression, and to cover himself under the pretence of a seeming deference and submission to the pretended holy chair. In order

[a] Inett, ii. 9; Dupin, cent. xi. chap. iii. p. 12.

thereunto he permitted the legates to do what had never been attempted from the first settlement of Christianity in the British isle, and what his successors had great reason to lament."[b]

The legates from Rome were permitted to summon a council, which met at Winchester in 1070. Until now the king or the archbishop had exercised this privilege. In this synod, Stigand, the archbishop of Canterbury, was deposed to make way for a Norman successor. Lanfranc was accordingly promoted to the office, and several other sees were also filled with Normans.[c] Papal writers make a great point of the presence of the legates at this council; yet it is clear that the permission on the part of the king was only a trick resorted to for the advancement of his own interests. It is also certain, that nothing was decided or even discussed in the council without the royal permission; so that the fact of the presence of the legates cannot be adduced in support of the pretensions of Rome.

Lanfranc himself convened a synod of his province at London during the same year, in which the Bishop of Worcester was deprived for insufficiency or want of learning. A monkish legend relates that Wulstan the bishop said to the king, taking off his robes, "A better man than thee arrayed me with these, to whom I will restore them," placing them at the same time on the tomb of Edward the Confessor, to whom he owed his promotion. The story adds, that the bishop struck his pastoral staff with so much force into the pavement, that the strongest arm could not remove it, upon which the king and the archbishop relented, and the bishop was restored.[d] Such is an outline of the story. It is certain that Wulstan continued in his see.

[b] Inett, ii. 11.

[c] Spelman, ii. 3; Inett, ii. 13-15; Labb. et Coss. ix. 1202; Wilkins, 322, 323; Johnson, an. 1070; Fuller, iii. 2; Collier, i. 240, 241; Saxon Chron. an. 1070.

[d] Spelman, ii. 4; Labb. et Coss. ix. 1203-4; Wilkins, i. 367, under the year 1078; Johnson, an. 1170; Inett, ii. 21; Godwin, 437, 438.

About the same time, at a council at Pedrede or Pederton, a new archbishop was consecrated to the see of York.[e]

A.D. 1072. The two Norman archbishops were soon involved in a controversy respecting the primacy; and a synod was assembled for the purpose of adjusting their respective claims. It was at last decided that the Church of York should be subject to Canterbury, the Archbishop of York yielding obedience in all things pertaining to religion. The boundaries of the provinces were also fixed; and it was determined that the Archbishop of Canterbury should have the power of summoning the Archbishop of York and his suffragans to a synod, the latter yielding obedience to the canonical decisions of the former. The decision was attested by the king and queen, fourteen bishops, and eleven abbots.[f]

In the year 1073, Hildebrand, the man who conceived the design of raising the papal power above all earthly kingdoms, was elevated to the papacy by the name of Gregory VII. Soon after his accession, in a council of bishops at Rome, he stated his views, contending that the pope should be called the universal bishop; that he alone should have power to depose bishops; that his legates should preside in councils; that he should exercise the right of deposing kings; that the calling of councils should be his privilege; and that his decision should be final. We see here the germ of that power which was exercised by his successors over kings; and from this period we may date the commencement of that usurpation which became so oppressive in subsequent ages.[g] The papal power succeeded at last in restraining the rights of kings: legates were sent

[e] Spelman, ii. 4; Wilkins, i. 324.

[f] Spelman, ii. 5; Labb. et Coss. ix. 1211-12; Hody, part iii. 12; Wilkins, i. 324, 325; Inett, ii. 30, 31; Cave's Hist. Lit. ii. 173.

[g] Wake's Authority, 174-179. Subsequent to the Conquest the popes began to usurp upon the crown: yet our sovereigns in the first instance permitted the aggression for their own ends. Eventually synods were brought under the control of the pope, being assembled by the archbishops or extraordinary legates. Very frequently, indeed, the king resisted the encroach-

into a kingdom, or a native bishop was appointed to the office. The Conqueror, indeed, never submitted, but only used the pope's authority to serve his own purpose, casting it off at his pleasure: and the same remark will apply to his sons, though in some cases circumstances compelled them to yield. But in process of time the power of Rome was riveted on both kings and people.

Lanfranc summoned a council to meet in St. Paul's Church, London, A.D. 1075. It was a national synod, both archbishops with their suffragans and many members of the religious orders being present. Many old canons were now revived. A question was also raised respecting the precedence of the bishops, and it was decided that the Archbishop of York should sit on the right hand of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London on the left, and Winchester next to York; or in the absence of the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London was to take place on the right and Winchester on the left hand of the archbishop. In this council permission was granted to the Bishops of Salisbury, Chichester, and Lichfield, to remove their residences from villages to cities. Other matters were ordered to stand over until the king returned from the Continent. The decisions of this council were subscribed by the two archbishops, twelve bishops, twenty-one abbots, and one archdeacon.[h] One of the canons is rather remarkable. It ordains that "none but bishops and abbots speak in council without license from the metropolitan;" which certainly seems to indicate that at this time the lower clergy, though present, did not vote in national and provincial synods. It might, indeed, have been merely a regulation for the purpose of maintaining order.[i]

ment. William I. never submitted, though he sometimes used the papal power to advance his own designs. Subsequent sovereigns yielded to or resisted the pope according to the circumstances in which they were placed.

[h] Spelman, ii. 7-11; Labb. et Coss. x. 346-350; Collier, i. 245; Wilkins, i. 363, 364; Inett, ii. 37, 38; Howell, i. 82; Foxe, 174; Johnson, an. 1075.

[i] Collier, i. 246-248.

Lanfranc convened another council in 1076, at Winchester, in which the question of clerical celibacy was discussed. Certain regulations were also agreed upon. It was ordained that no canon should marry; and that in future the bishops should not ordain any person unless he was unmarried. The clergy in towns and villages were allowed to retain their wives. So that it is clear, from the proceedings of the council, that the question was not yet settled. These very canons prove also that the doctrine is a modern invention.[j] It is supposed that Lanfranc prepared the way for the reception of the doctrine of *transubstantiation* in the Church of England; for at the Conquest it had not been received. It was introduced by the Norman clergy after many of the English had been removed.[k]

Two other councils appear to have met at Winchester about this time. Johnson, however, places them under the years 1070 and 1071, on the ground that the rates of penance subjoined to the proceedings of the councils are said to have been confirmed by the pope's legate, Hermanfride, who came over in 1070. One of the canons of the second council prohibits the burial of the dead in churches. The rules concerning penance, intended for those who had served in William's army, and had slain others in battle, are very singular. "Let him who knows that he has killed a man in the great battle, do penance one year for every one." They justified war, and yet called upon the soldiers to do penance for acting in obedience to their orders. Again: "For every one that he struck, if he was not sure that he died, if he remember the number, forty days' penance for each man. If he knew not the number, let him do penance one day in every week at the bishop's discretion; or let him redeem it by building or endowing a church. Let him who intended to strike a man, though

[j] Spelman, ii. 13; Labb. et Coss. x. 351-353; Johnson, an. 1076; Wilkins, i. 365-367; Collier, i. 245-249; Parker, 170; Dupin, cent. xi. 122; Cave, ii. 176.

[k] Inett, ii. 39; Parker, 114.

he did it not, do three days' penance. As to the clergy who fought, because they are forbidden to fight, let them repent as if they had sinned in their own country. Let them who fought through hopes of reward do penance as for murder."[1]

It was also fixed at this council, that every bishop should summon his diocesan synod once in every year. Diocesan synods are now almost unknown. Their restoration, however, would be for the advantage of the Church. Such synods in ancient times were composed of the bishop and certain presbyters, whose business it was to enforce the canons of general, national, or provincial councils, as well as to arrange rules of discipline for themselves. The *Reformatio Legum*, drawn up at the period of the Reformation, provided for their restoration, in conformity with the ancient and laudable practice of the Church. The mode of holding diocesan synods in these early times was as follows:

The clergy went in solemn procession to the church appointed by the bishop, taking their seats according to the priority of their ordination. The deacons and laity were admitted; the bishop then addressed the audience, after which a sermon was preached. The clergy submitted their complaints to the bishop; and the laity submitted theirs; and in the next place the bishop proposed his diocesan constitutions. A synodical exhortation to the clergy followed, and then the solemn benediction. Three days were assigned for holding these diocesan synods, though they separated sooner, if all the business was transacted. The ancient *form* is exceedingly interesting. When the bishop entered into the synod; "Tunc dicat diaconus, *Orate:* deinde, *Erigite vos:* tunc episcopus, versus ad orientem, mediocri voce dicat, *Deus vobiscum.*" The deacon then read a portion from the Gospel, after which the hymn *Veni Creator* was sung. The benediction was some-

[1] Spelman, ii. 11-13; Johnson, an. 1070; Wilkins, 1. 366.

what different at the close of each day. That for the *first* day was as follows: "Qui dispersos Israel congregat, ipse vos hic et ubique custodiat, Amen: et non solum vos custodiat, sed ovium suarum custodes idoneos efficiat, Amen: ut cum summo pastore Christo de gregum suorum pastione gaudeatis in cœlo, Amen: quod ipse parare dignetur."

Councils were held in 1077 and 1078; though very little is known respecting their proceedings.[m] But in the year 1085 a most important change was effected by the Conqueror in the mode of holding ecclesiastical councils. To this time the bishops with their clergy met in the same court with the barons and commons. Thus the bishop and sheriff sat in the same place, the one deciding in ecclesiastical, the other in civil matters.

"If the matter to be deliberated upon were purely spiritual, the bishops went apart by themselves, and debated upon it."[n] Mixed affairs were settled in mixed assemblies of clergy and laity; but spiritual matters were discussed by the clergy alone. Thus the *Laws Ecclesiastical* of Athelstan were made by authority of the bishops; while his other *Constitutions* were signed by all. Besides these mixed meetings, however, there were occasionally some assemblies which were purely ecclesiastical convocations or synods.[o] The law by which William effected the change states that the ancient canons respecting the councils were not regarded in England; which is strong evidence that our ancestors did not submit to Rome until after the Conquest. Popery was a usurpation on our ancient govern-

[m] Spelman, ii. 14; Labb. et Coss. x 404; Wilkins, i. 367.

[n] Wake's Authority, 158.

[o] Ibid. 162, 163. "Before the Conquest the ecclesiastical and temporal court was the same, the bishop of every diocese sitting in judicature, together with the alderman or sheriff; and as one determined all matters merely *secular*, so did the other all that concerned the Church and religion; and if the course were mixed, they both performed their part, and gave their mutual assistance; though the bishops still held their synods and visitations, and there exercised the more important parts of discipline." Johnson's *Vade Mecum*, i. 272.

ment. From this time, therefore, ecclesiastical matters usually were decided in ecclesiastical assemblies.[p]

The first council of which any particulars remain, after this important change, was assembled in the next reign, on the death of Lanfranc. It appears, indeed, that Lanfranc held councils at Winchester, London, and Gloucester. In the year 1093 a council was convened for the purpose of consecrating Anselm to the archbishopric of Canterbury. More properly, perhaps, this meeting may be regarded as merely an assembly of the bishops. When the instrument of election was read, the Archbishop of York objected that it was not correctly worded, inasmuch as the church of Canterbury was called "*totius Britanniæ metropolitana*," which would exclude the church of York from being a metropolitan church at all. The objection was admitted; and the word "*primas*" was substituted for "*metropolitana;*" so that from this time the Archbishop of Canterbury has been designated "*totius Britanniæ primas.*"[q]

In 1094 a council was assembled at Rockingham for the purpose of deciding whether Anselm, consistently with his obedience to the see of Rome, could acknowledge the royal power in certain matters ecclesiastical. The pretensions of the papal see were now most extravagant; and Anselm was inclined to favour them; so that he became embroiled with his sovereign. The proceedings of this and the next reign mark the steps by which the popes arrived at that power, which became so oppressive to the sovereign and people. It is very remarkable, that when Hildebrand conceived the project of raising the papacy above the kingdoms of the world, many circumstances

[p] Spelman, ii. 14, 15; Johnson, an. 1085.

[q] Spelman, ii. 15, 16; Collier, i. 267; Wilkins, i. 368-370. The separation of the civil and ecclesiastical affairs laid the foundation of appeals to Rome in subsequent times. Lanfranc died an. 1089; consequently Canterbury was vacant several years, the king seizing the revenues. Anglia Sacra, ii. 685; Saxon Chron. an. 1090; Cave's Hist. Lit. ii. 145, 146; Inett, ii. 72; Collier, i. 260; Foxe, 183. The doctrine of a corporal presence was first maintained in the Church of England under Lanfranc. Usher's Answer, 54.

favoured his ambitious designs. The Empire was weak, the emperor and the German princes being in a state of discord; France under an infant sovereign; Spain under the dominion or exposed to the incursions of the Moors; Italy divided into many small states; and the Norman government in England not fully settled.[r] The pope would not, however, have succeeded in England, had he not been supported by the clergy, William I. would not permit his bishops to attend a council at Rome, A.D. 1079, summoned for the purpose of confirming the supremacy. At length, our sovereigns becoming weaker, the pope succeeded in his object in England. At this time there were two rival popes; one being recognised by the king, the other by the archbishop. Anselm requested permission to take the *pall* from Urban, whom the king rejected. He also told the archbishop, that no one could, by the laws of the land, own any pope or go to Rome without permission. The archbishop therefore assembled the council for the purpose of considering the subject.[s] The question was debated whether Anselm could obey the king, and at the same time yield obedience to the holy see. The bishops, with one exception, recommended submission to the king, and on his refusal, some of them refused to acknowledge him as their metropolitan.[t] In the end, a legate came over from Rome, the *pall* was received, and the matter apparently settled. Some time after, Anselm went to Rome in direct opposition to the king. The pope made an ineffectual attempt to interpose in his favour; for at present it was the law of the land, that the Bishop of Rome had no jurisdiction in England. No other ecclesiastical synod was held during this reign.[u]

William Rufus died A.D. 1100, during Anselm's ab-

[r] Inett, ii. 40. [s] Ib. ii. 78; Collier, i. 269. [t] Inett, ii. 79, 85, 91.

[u] Wake's Authority, 185. It has been questioned whether the councils of this reign were not mixed or parliamentary assemblies. Wake's State of the Church, 166, 167; Hody, part iii. 23. It would appear that the Council of Rockingham was a mixed assembly of prelates, clergy, and nobles. Wilkins, i. 371-374; Spelman, ii. 16-19.

sence at Rome. His successor, Henry I., was induced to recall the archbishop, who came home entertaining the same notion respecting the papal see. He refused to do homage to the king, though the other bishops rendered it; alleging that the council at Rome, which had been held during his residence in that city, had prohibited the practice, together with that of receiving *investiture* from princes. At this time the pope sent a legate to England; an act as offensive to Anselm as to the king, and both concurred in resisting his authority, on the ground that such a proceeding was contrary to law. Still the motives by which the monarch and the prelate were influenced were different; the former resisted, on the ground that the papal see could not interfere in his kingdom; the prelate from the conviction that his own power, as metropolitan, would be weakened by the exercise of the legantine authority. In the issue the legate was compelled to quit the country.[v] Though, however, the king and the archbishop concurred on this point, there were others respecting which they took opposite views. The question of *investiture* was one. It had been the custom for bishops, on doing homage to the king, to receive a *ring* and a *pastoral staff*. Attempts had been made to deprive the monarch of this right; and bishops had occasionally refused to accept the *ring* and the *staff* from their sovereigns. In England, indeed, the bishops had generally submitted, before the time of Anselm; and even now some of them declared that they would rather quit the communion of the Church of Rome than permit the laws of the land to be violated by papal decrees. While this dispute was going on, Robert, duke of Normandy, the king's brother, landed in England; and Henry, fearing lest Anselm and others should join his standard, yielded the point of *investitures*. By this concession Anselm was kept quiet, and the two brothers were reconciled.[w]

[v] Inett, ii. 94.

[w] Ibid. ii. 105, 107, 108; Collier, i. 300; Father Paul on Ecclesiastical Benefices and Revenues; Labb. et Coss. x. 755, 756.

In the year 1102 the archbishop was permitted to hold a council at London, at which the Archbishop of York and certain other bishops were present. Two accounts, varying from each other in some particulars, are extant respecting this council. A body of canons was framed, but the most remarkable related to the question of clerical celibacy, which was still unsettled.[x]

Though Henry had apparently yielded the point respecting *investitures* when the presence of his brother inspired him with fear, yet he did not keep the promise which he made; but he commanded the Archbishop of York to consecrate those bishops who received *investiture* from him. Some of the prelates hesitated; and in these circumstances, the king sent Anselm to Rome to persuade the pope to yield the point, intending to forbid the archbishop's return in the event of a refusal. The pope refused, and Anselm was forbidden to return. Some time after, the archbishop visited the king's sister at Blois, to whom he stated his intention of excommunicating her brother. Henry was unpopular among his subjects in consequence of the heavy burdens which had been imposed upon the country; and fearing lest his brother should gain the support of Anselm and the pope, he listened to the intercessions of his sister, and was reconciled to the archbishop.[y] Anselm returned A.D. 1107. It was decided in a council, that none should be invested by the king; but it was conceded by the archbishop that none should be denied consecration on account of doing homage to the sovereign.[z] By such means did the papacy advance in England. Henry yielded to the chains which Rome prepared: and at length the pontiffs, having acquired the power of investing individuals with the possessions of the

[x] Spelman, ii. 21-25; Johnson, an. 1102; Labb. et Coss. x. 728-30; Parker, 179, 180; Wilkins, i. 382-384; Inett, ii. 111, 112; Collier, i. 286-288.

[y] Spelman, ii. 25; Inett, ii. 118; Wilkins, i. 384.

[z] Spelman, ii. 29; Johnson, an. 1107; Inett, ii. 123; Wilkins, i. 386, 387; Collier, i. 288-290.

Church, were acknowledged as supreme ordinaries. The next year ten canons were agreed upon in another council at London, which chiefly referred to clerical celibacy. It is clear, however, from the fact that so many canons were enacted, that the clergy did not submit willingly to the yoke. A council was also convened in London in the ensuing year, relative to the old dispute of precedence between the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York, when the latter signed a form of submission.[a]

Anselm, who died A.D. 1109, was succeeded by Ralph, who was enthroned without any application to Rome; so that the ascendency of the pope was not yet completely established. In the year 1115 the clergy of the bishopric of St. David applied to Henry for a bishop. The king recommended one of his chaplains, who, on his consecration, made a profession of canonical obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury. About this time a legate was sent into England; but Henry, though he did not forbid his entrance, assured him that he received him only as a private person, telling him also that no legate could come into England without permission, and that he would not suffer the laws of the land to be broken. The legate therefore departed without exercising his office.[b]

Ralph died A.D. 1122, when William Corbell was advanced to the see of Canterbury. It now became evident to the Roman pontiff, that his authority could not be established in England unless his legates were permitted to exercise their office. Henry being involved in difficulties, and being unwilling to offend the court of Rome, lest his difficulties should be increased, consented to receive *John De Crema* in the character of a legate from the pope. This fatal step was taken A.D. 1125.[c] This same year, therefore, a council was summoned at Westminster, in which the legate presided. The archbishop, however,

[a] Spelman, ii. 31, 32; Johnson, an. 1108; Labb. et Coss. x. 756-758; Wilkins, i. 390, 391; Foxe, 194, 195.

[b] Inett, ii. 149; Collier, i. 303.

[c] Inett, ii. 152.

summoned the council; and in the summons to the Bishop of Llandaff, he expressly states, that the synod was to take place by his permission.[d] Henry was absent at the time; but the legate, on his way, obtained the royal permission to command the archbishop to summon a national council.[e] Yet this council was appealed to in after ages as a proof of the right of the papal see to call and preside in councils. The two archbishops and twenty bishops, with many abbots, priors, archdeacons, and clergy, were present. Seventeen canons were enacted. By the *fourth*, no one was permitted to receive any ecclesiastical benefice from a layman without the consent of the bishop. This was intended to settle the question of *investitures*. Eventually, as we shall perceive, the papal see contended that the clergy were exempt from the civil authority altogether. Celibacy also was enjoined; and yet the repeated canons prove that the rules were disregarded.[f]

Still a feeling of indignation existed in the country against the reception of a papal legate; a feeling in which the king was a participator, though he had consented to receive him. Under these circumstances, the Archbishop of Canterbury was sent to Rome to remonstrate with the pope on the subject. Never, perhaps, were the wily arts of Rome crowned with greater success than in this instance; for though the archbishop protested strongly against the exercise of the legantine authority, yet he was induced by the pontiff to accept of the office for himself, and actually returned to England in the character of a legate from Rome. A controversy existed between the two archbishops; and it seems probable that Corbell accepted the office in order that he might exercise authority in the province of York.

[d] Inett, ii. 154; Spelman, ii. 33. "In it was made the first considerable invasion upon the prince's authority as to this matter in these parts." Wake's Authority, 186; Wilkins, i. 408; Bramhall's Works, 327.

[e] Wake's Authority, 187.

[f] Spelman, ii. 32-34; Labb. et Coss. x. 912-915; Johnson, an. 1126; Collier, i. 318, 319; Wilkins, i. 406-408; Inett, ii. 157, 158; Johnson, an. 1126; Bar. An. 1125, 12; Foxe, 199.

From this period we must "date the vassalage of the English Church, and lay the foundation of that authority to convene councils in England, to preside in them, and form canons therein, to which the Bishops of Rome afterwards pretended. However, the archbishop did not penetrate into the consequences of his own indiscretion; but, having cured his own vanity by taking upon himself the character of legate, he returned to England to help forward the usurpation, which he went to Rome on purpose to suppress."[g] According to Wake, he applied for the office in order to prevent the coming over of a legate from Rome, "and so unhappily brought the kingdom and his own dignity under a greater servitude."[h] Henry Wharton remarks that "he subjected his own see and the Church of England to the authority of the see of Rome, which before were wholly independent of it."[i]

Arriving in England in his new character, he summoned a council at Westminster in 1127, in which he presided as primate and legate. He mentions his new authority, "as if he had been fond of the chains he had helped to put about his own neck."[j] It was the first council of the kind held by an English archbishop.[k] Ten bishops were present, three of them from Wales; and *ten* canons were enacted. The *first* is couched in terms previously unknown to the Anglican Church: "By the authority of Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and our own." The *second* has the following expression: "By the authority of the Apostolic See." Hitherto the archbishops of Canterbury had summoned national councils by their own authority: this was convened by authority of the pope, and the archbishop submitted.[l] Marriage was prohibited to priests; though, by the connivance of the civil power,

[g] Inett, ii. 163. [h] Wake's Authority, 189.

[i] Strype's Cranmer, ii. 1040; Carte's History, i. 516.

[j] Inett, ii. 165. [k] Wake's Authority, 189.

[l] Spelman, ii. 35, 36; Labb. et Coss. x. 920; Johnson, an. 1127; Inett, ii. 165; Collier, i. 321, 322; Wilkins, i. 410, 411; Wake's State, 171; Dupin, xii. 212.

the canons on the subject were for some time disregarded.[m] The question of celibacy was enforced by another council, A.D. 1129; but the execution of the law being left to the king, the clergy were permitted to retain their wives on paying certain sums into the royal exchequer.[n]

We now pass on to the year 1138, when a council was convened under King Stephen, in which Alberic, bishop of Ostia, the papal legate, presided. Stephen had seized on the throne, on the death of his uncle, in 1135; and, to secure the favour of the pope, he consented to make concessions which none of his predecessors ever contemplated. The pontiff, perceiving that it would be to his advantage to support Stephen, sanctioned his occupancy of the throne.[o] Eighteen bishops, the proctor for the Archbishop of York, with many of the clergy, were present. Seventeen canons were passed by the council, some of which were the same as Corbell's, while others were very ridiculous.[p] In the same year the legate held a synod at Carlisle of the bishops of Scotland. His authority was extended over both countries. The Bishop of Winchester, the king's brother, who had been appointed the pope's legate, was anxious to obtain the see of Canterbury; but Theobald was raised to that dignity. Alberic quitted England shortly after the council, leaving the Bishop of Winchester to act as legate. In a little time, in order to humble King Stephen, the pope began to favour the claims of Maud, the daughter of Henry. The Bishop of Winchester also took the opportunity of being revenged on his brother for his disappointment in not obtaining the

[m] "This is the first ecclesiastical council that appears to me to have been held at the same time with a convention of the nobility, and yet in a separate place." Hody, part iii. 37.

[n] Spelman, ii. 37; Labb. et Coss. x. 942; Inett, ii. 166.

[o] Inett, ii. 175; Saxon Chron. an. 1129; Inett, ii. 166, 167; Anglia Sacra, i. 792; Lingard, ii. 144. A council was assembled at London in 1132 to settle a dispute between the bishops of St. David and Llandaff; another met at Westminster in 1136; and a third at Hereford, an. 1137. The last, however, was evidently a diocesan synod. Wilkins, 412, 413.

[p] Spelman, ii. 39-44; Labb. et Coss. x. 992-998; Johnson, an. 1138; Collier, i. 330, 331; Wilkins, i. 413-418; Parker, 193.

see of Canterbury. As legate, he summoned a council at Winchester, A.D. 1139, to which the king was called, and in which the bishop acted with the greatest arrogance. From whatever cause, Stephen does not appear to have resented his brother's conduct.[q]

Several legantine councils were held about this time. One was convened at London, in 1141, by the Bishop of Winchester as legate; another at Winchester, A.D. 1142. In the latter, King Stephen having been taken prisoner by the forces of the empress, the legate proclaimed Maud queen. For a time every thing seemed to favour her cause. It is, indeed, said that her failure was owing entirely to the legate; a circumstance which evidences the power of the Church at this time. At first the legate attended Maud as a part of her court; but on her refusal to grant certain earldoms in Normandy to his nephew, he absented himself; and having formerly excommunicated all who opposed the empress, he now absolved them from the sentence, and at the same time declared that he owed her no allegiance.[r] The empress endeavoured, but without effect, to regain the legate; and the Earl of Gloucester, being taken prisoner by some of Stephen's adherents, was exchanged for the king. At this juncture another council met at Westminster, in which King Stephen was present to complain of the injuries which he had received from his people. The wily pontiff addressed a letter to the legate, which was read at the council, and in which he complains that Stephen was not set at liberty, though he had previously supported the claims of the empress. The legate now stated that he had acted involuntarily in his transactions

[q] Inett, ii. 184; Spelman, ii. 44; Labb. et Coss. x. 1014-16. "He who founded one part of his title to the crown upon the papal authority could hardly be supposed capable of denying the same power which his predecessor had allowed him." Wake's Authority, 190; Wilkins, i. 419.

[r] Spelman, ii. 44-47; Labb. et Coss. x. 1024, 1029-33; Collier, i. 335, 336; Inett, ii. 193. "Three synods we meet with during the reign of this king, and every one held by the legantine power." Wake's Authority, 190. Archdeacons are mentioned in the Council in 1142. Wilkins, i. 420.

with Maud; and he commanded all, in the name of God and the pope, to submit to Stephen.[s] A council was called in 1143 at Winchester to check the barbarities of the war. A canon was enacted, that none who violated a church or churchyard, or laid violent hands on a clergyman, should be absolved except by the pope.[t]

The commotions consequent upon the rival claims of Maud the empress and Stephen were favourable to the advancement of the pretensions of Rome. It was of little consequence to the pope whether the crown were possessed by one or the other: he knew that he must reap the advantage arising from the dispute. The Church therefore was in a very distracted state. Just at this time, Theobald, who was probably jealous of the Bishop of Winchester, and wishing to exercise jurisdiction in the province of York, accepted the office of legate from the pope, who confirmed it to him and his successors, who were designated *legati nati*, or *perpetual legates*. By such slow but sure advances did the Bishop of Rome establish his authority over the Anglican Church.[u]

During these confusions the papal power was advanced to a great extent in England; and the legate actually turned the scale in favour of Stephen. It was therefore agreed that Stephen should enjoy the crown during his life, but that at his death it should go to Henry, duke of Normandy, the son of the empress. Appeals to Rome now became common, originating in the disputes between the legate and the archbishop.[v] Stephen died A.D. 1154.

Henry succeeded to the throne in right of his mother, the empress, the daughter of Henry I. A synod appears to have been summoned in the first year of his reign.[w] One is mentioned in 1157, and another was convened at Oxford

[s] Spelman, ii. 46; Collier, i. 336; Wilkins, i. 419-422.
[t] Spelman, ii. 47; Johnson, an. 1143; Collier, i. 337.
[u] Inett, ii. 187, 188; Ang. Sac. i. 7; Parker, 193-195.
[v] Johnson, an. 1143; Collier, i. 336, 340; Wilkins, i. 424; Foxe, 201.
[w] Wilkins, i. 426; Spelman, ii. 51.

in 1160 against certain heretics, who came over from the Continent. The parties were subjected to punishment, and their opinions appear to have been suppressed. It was ordered, that no person should relieve these poor creatures, so that they actually perished from want.[x]

On the death of Theobald in 1162, Thomas Becket, who was already chancellor, was chosen to succeed him in a council of the bishops of the province, assembled at London. The choice was also confirmed by the king.[y] From the time of his promotion he became a different man; and never did a sovereign commit a greater mistake than Henry in his advancement of Becket. He soon entered upon a quarrel with the king relative to the question, whether the clergy should be subject to the same laws as the laity. Under these circumstances, a convention met at Clarendon, in which several constitutions were made on this subject; but as the assembly was more of a parliament than an ecclesiastical synod, it will not be necessary to dwell at length upon its proceedings in this work. Several of the constitutions, however, relate to the clergy, and originated in the separation of the temporal and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the time of William I. There was now a struggle between the secular and ecclesiastical authorities. The *third* article, therefore, provides, that clergymen are to answer accusations in the civil as well as in the ecclesiastical courts; but in the latter case the king's judge or justice was authorised to send to the court to ascertain how matters were conducted. By the *eighth* article, the king is made the party to whom final appeals were to be sent. This enactment was evidently intended to check the practice of carrying appeals to Rome; and it is clear that Henry was

[x] Spelman, ii. 59, 60; Howell, i. 93; Collier, i. 348; Inett, 233; Labb. et Coss. x. 1140, 1176-1184. This Council is given by Wilkins under the year 1166: Wilkins, i. 438, 439; Harpsfeild, 384; Neubrig, lib. ii. c. 13.

[y] Spelman, ii. 61; Labb. et Coss. x. 1410. It is said of the reign of Henry III. that the pope's usurped power "began now to plead prescription in its favour." Wake's Authority, 191; Wilkins, i. 434.

resolved to oppose the growing influence and encroachment of the papal see. In the year 1163, Becket had gone to the synod of Tours, at which the pope was present, by whom he was honoured with a chair at his right hand. The pontiff understood Becket's character; and in consequence of the favour shewn him by the pope, he returned with still loftier notions of the ecclesiastical power. In a council at Westminster, the king demanded of the bishops whether they would observe the ancient customs of the kingdom. They replied that they would do so, *saving their order*. Becket promised the king that he would comply without any such *salvo;* and to enforce a public ratification of this promise, the convention of Clarendon was summoned. Yet, after all, Becket refused to comply, and retired to the Continent, whence he fulminated his anathemas against the king and his subjects. This state of things continued during seven years; but at length a reconciliation was effected, and Becket returned to England.[z]

The circumstances connected with Becket's death, which took place soon after his return, need not be detailed. The king excused himself at Rome; nor did the pope deem it expedient openly to charge Henry with the murder: but eventually the pontiff was enabled to use the event to the advantage of the see of Rome; for the monarch, to free himself from the imputation of murder, consented to proposals which involved a renunciation of those rights for which he had been contending. In the year 1172, he met the papal legates in Normandy, when he agreed to permit appeals to Rome, to go to Jerusalem for three years to fight for the Holy Land, to recall Becket's friends, and to repeal all customs introduced during his reign preju-

[z] Spelman, ii. 63, 64; Johnson, an. 1164; Collier, i. 351-353; Labb. et Coss. x. 1425-7; Wilkins, i. 434-436. A mixed council appears to have been assembled in 1170 to deliberate concerning the coronation of Prince Henry. Wilkins, i. 458; Howell, i. 93, 94; Ang. Sac. ii. 689; Dupin, xi. 125, 126; Foxe, 207.

dicial to the interests of the Church. Thus did the king relinquish all for which he had contended; thus did he confirm the papal usurpation in England.[a] "Watered with Becket's blood, the papal usurpation soon grew up to its full completement and perfection."[b] By such steps did the pope establish his power over the Anglican Church. The articles of Clarendon were now set aside by the concessions which were wrung from the king, who was mainly instrumental in aiding the designs of the papal see. William I. called in the aid of the pope to depose some of the Saxon prelates; Stephen got his title to the crown confirmed at Rome, and solicited the legantine power for his brother; and even Henry II., to serve his own interests, accepted from Pope Adrian a title to the kingdom of Ireland. The authority therefore, which these sovereigns countenanced when it suited their purpose, became at length, by various arts, in which the popes were better versed than the monarchs, superior to that of the crown.

Richard, prior of Dover, succeeded Becket in the archbishopric in 1173, when a council met at Westminster.[c] In 1175 another was convened, at which were present the king and his son, with eleven bishops, exclusive of the Bishop of St. David's. A body of canons, drawn from the decrees of councils and popes, was framed and promulgated.[d] The Archbishop of York now claimed the privilege of having his cross carried before him in the province of Canterbury; and the result of the controversy was an appeal to Rome,—a proceeding never objected to by the pope, whose power was magnified, and whose interests were promoted by such measures. The king endeavoured to settle the dispute between the two metropolitans in a council at Winchester, but without effect. At last Cardinal Hugo was sent as legate from the pope, with au-

[a] Johnson, an. 1164; Inett, ii. 280; Collier, i. 379.

[b] Inett, ii. 281.

[c] Wilkins, i. 474.

[d] Spelman, ii. 103-107; Labb. et Coss. x. 1461-1468; Johnson, an. 1175; Collier, i. 381, 382; Wilkins, i. 476

thority to determine the question; yet the object of his mission was only partially accomplished. He presided, however, in a council at Westminster, A.D. 1176, the Archbishop of Canterbury taking his seat on the right, and the place on the left of the legate being assigned to the Archbishop of York. The latter prelate was so exasperated, that he seated himself in Canterbury's lap. Confusion ensued in the council; York was trampled upon, and the parties made their appeal to Rome.[e]

Henry died in the year 1189, the kingdom being in great confusion, and the see of Rome triumphant. Richard, who succeeded to the throne, undertook the journey to Palestine, and during his absence all ecclesiastical affairs were managed at Rome. The usurpation, which was now completed, continued, though not without efforts on the part of some of the sovereigns to cast it off, until the Reformation. The legates exercised all power in the Church; and sometimes, when the legantine authority was vested in a bishop, the metropolitan was subject to one of his suffragans. By a constitution of Pope Alexander III., directed to the province of Canterbury, it was stated that, though as metropolitan the archbishop had no cognizance of ecclesiastical matters, yet as legate he could adjust all cases which might be referred to his adjudication.[f]

The legantine authority was granted to Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, who, in 1195, summoned a council at York. It appears, however, that the bishops were not

[e] Labb. et Coss. x. 1479-80; Wilkins, i. 485; Spelman, ii. 112. Two other Councils were assembled in 1177 at Northampton and Westminster; but they were evidently parliamentary and mixed meetings. Wilkins, i. 485, 486; Spelman, ii. 113, 114. Another met in 1182, at which a grant was made to the pope, and one in 1184 to choose an archbishop. Wilkins, i. 488.

[f] Inett, ii. 312, 313. Councils, which were mixed assemblies of bishops, clergy, and laity, are mentioned in 1189 and 1190. Wilkins, i. 492, 493. One met at London in 1191, to elect an archbishop; and another in 1193, during the vacancy of the see, at the command of the king. Ib. i. 495, 496; Spelman, ii. 116-119.

present, and that the canons were issued in the legate's name. The dean and chapter protested against his authority as archbishop, but submitted to him as legate, — a circumstance which shews that the clergy were generally favourable to the pretensions of the pope. Several constitutions, taken chiefly from the more recent councils, were put forth, though some few were selected from the ancient canons.[g]

A national council was assembled, by Hubert, at London, in 1200. Canons, as usual, were enacted for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. The king was absent in France at the time; and the chief justice of the kingdom made his appearance in the council, and protested against the proceedings, on the ground that it was not sanctioned by the sovereign. The legate acted by his own authority; and the fact of calling a council under such circumstances proves that the pope's power was firmly established. This appears to have been the first decided instance of that independent power which was exercised by the papal legates, and which continued, with some interruptions, until the Reformation.[h]

Hubert died in 1206, when a double election was made by the monks of Canterbury. To put an end to the dispute, the pope rejected both the individuals selected by the monks, and promoted Stephen Langton to the archbishopric. The appointment was subsequently confirmed by the

[g] Spelman, ii. 120-123; Johnson, an. 1195; Labb. et Coss. x. 1792-5; Inett, ii. 363, 364; Collier, i. 407. By one of the constitutions a light was ordered to be carried before the host, when it was taken to the sick. The archbishop added a clause, "saving the authority of the Roman see," to the canons. He was proud of his office as papal legate. Wilkins, i. 501-503. Another council met in 1099 at Westminster. Ib. 504.

[h] Spelman, ii. 123-128; Wilkins, i. 505-508; Johnson, an. 1200; Echard's History, i. 234; Labb. et Coss. xi. 14-20. It seems that John Ferentinus, the papal legate, held a synod at Reading in 1206, and quitted England with a large sum of money. Wake's Authority, 194. Here also the host was ordered to be preceded by a light and a cross; and various minute regulations for the consecration of the wine were given. The priest was to wash his hands, lest some drops should adhere to his fingers. The chalice also was to be washed, and the water which was used for the purpose was to be drunk.

monks; but the king refused to receive him, and the kingdom was placed under an interdict. It was published A.D. 1207, and generally observed; so that all the offices of religion, except baptism, confession, and the offices to the dying, were suspended. In the year 1209, the king was excommunicated, and subsequently he was actually deposed. The king was at length so broken in spirit, that he yielded to the pope's demands. Among the humiliating conditions which were imposed upon John by the haughty pontiff were these, that he should hold his kingdom as a *fee* of the papacy, and pay an annual tribute to Rome. The king even consented to receive back his crown from the hands of the papal legate, by whom the interdict was removed in a council at London, A.D. 1214.[i] It seems that a council was held earlier this year at Dunstable, from which two persons were deputed to ask the legate to stay proceedings.[j] So completely was King John subdued by the tyrannical pope, that he was actually forced to say, that he acted in the whole business of his own free will.[k] The king died in 1216, and was succeeded by Henry III.

Archbishop Langton convened a council at Oxford in 1222 for the reformation of the Church. A large body of canons was put forth, under the title of *Archbishop Langton's Constitutions*, many of which were taken from the decrees of the Lateran council, A.D. 1216.[l] Langton was a

[i] A council was convened at St. Alban's in 1206, and another at London in 1207 by King John. The latter was a mixed assembly. Wilkins, i. 514, 515, 544; Spelman, ii. 134. In 1210 a mixed assembly met at London, and a legantine synod at Northampton in 1211, at which the excommunication of the king was proclaimed. Wilkins, i. 531.

[j] Labb. et Coss. xi. 102; Wake's Authority, 196.

[k] Spelman, ii. 135; Labb. et Coss. xi. 102, 103. The papal legate assembled a council at Bristol in 1216 to take the oaths to Henry. Though it was summoned by the legate, yet the barons were present as well as the bishops. Wilkins, i. 546. In the same year the king, the archbishop, and bishops, met at Canterbury for the translation of the bones of Becket. Ib. 572. In 1220, Richard bishop of Durham published Constitutions. Spelman, ii. 161-180.

[l] Spelman, ii. 181-189; Johnson, an. 1222; Labb. et Coss. xi. 270-287; Lynwood's Con. 1-10; Wilkins, i. 585-597; Wake's Authority, 196.

fearless opponent of the pope, as well as of his sovereign. When John resigned his crown to the papal legate, the archbishop headed the peers in a protest against the validity of the act; yet he had been advanced by the pope's authority.

Another council appears to have been held at Westminster in 1226, in which the papal legate submitted certain proposals for raising money for the pope.[m] These requests, however, were refused. Some years later, certain constitutions were published under the name of Edmund archbishop of Canterbury; but how, or in what council, they were enacted, it is not possible to determine.[n] One of them relative to confession is very curious. "The priest at confession is to have his face and eyes looking toward the ground, not in the countenance of the penitent, especially if it be a woman. Let him inquire after usual sins, but not after unusual, unless it be at a distance and indirectly." The reader will determine whether such a rule is in conformity with the present practice of the Church of Rome, and with the rules exhibited in Dens' Theology.

King Henry invited Otto into England, as legate from the pope, who summoned a council at London, A.D. 1237. This was a council of both provinces, a national or legantine synod. On the first day, the legate was absent; but the decrees intended to be enacted were submitted to the council. The second day he appeared with great pomp, seated on an elevated throne, supported on his right by the Archbishop of Canterbury, on his left by the Archbishop of

[m] Spelman, ii. 190; Labb. et Coss. xi. 302, 303; Collier, i. 429; Wake's Authority, 196; Wilkins, i. 620, 621.

[n] Spelman, ii. 199-208; Johnson, an. 1236; Labb. et Coss. xi. 503-514; Wilkins, i. 635-640. Bishops were now strictly bound to put forth diocesan constitutions. Those of Richard Poore, bishop of Sarum, in 1223, and those of the Bishop of Coventry, in 1237, are worthy of notice. Wilkins, i. 599-602, 640-646; Spelman, ii. 134-160, 208-217. A mixed council was held by the legate in 1229, at which his demand of money for the pope was only yielded to by the bishops, after much murmuring, through fear of excommunication. Wilkins, i. 622, 623.

York. A prohibition was sent from the king, forbidding the council to enact any decrees against the dignity of the crown. In this council the papal canonization of St. Francis and St. Dominic was made public. The decrees were prepared by the legate, and then submitted to the council,[o] at which they were merely read, not discussed. They ran in the legate's name.

Several councils were held in the reign of Henry III., of which few particulars are preserved. Some were held by the papal legate for the purpose of obtaining money for the pope; others by the archbishops, at the king's command, to raise contributions for the sovereign. In the years 1238, 1239, 1240, 1246, councils were held in behalf of the pope, who lost no opportunity of attempting to procure money from England. They were assembled for one and the same object, namely, money. In some cases the grant was positively refused.[p] In 1241, 1244, 1252, others met at Oxford and London, for purposes of revenue to the crown.[q]

It was a common practice at this period with bishops to put forth constitutions for their own dioceses, which were either selected or framed by themselves, or arranged in diocesan synods. Of this character were those of Walter Cantilupe, bishop of Worcester, A.D. 1240, and those of Richard De la Wich, bishop of Chichester, in 1246.[r]

The constitutions which were put forth after the establishment of the papal domination were of three kinds: legantine or national, under the papal legate; provincial by

[o] Spelman, ii. 218-229; Labb. et Coss. xi. 525-544; Johnson, an. 1237. The legate opened the council in the words of the prophet Ezekiel: "In the middle of the throne and round about were four animals, full of eyes behind and before." These he considered as an emblem of episcopal circumspection. Seven sacraments are enjoined in the second constitution. Wilkins, i. 647-656; Lynwood's Con. Leg. 3-17.

[p] Wilkins, i. 663, 678, 681, 686-688; Spelman, ii. 260, 261.

[q] Wilkins, i. 682, 684, 685.

[r] Wilkins, i. 665, 688-694; Spelman, ii. 240-260; Wilkins, i. 704-708.

the two archbishops; and diocesan by the bishops in their respective sees. In the year 1250, Walter Gray, archbishop of York, published certain constitutions by his own authority: but they were so well received, that some of them were adopted in subsequent years by the synod of the province of Canterbury. In 1255, Walter Kirkham, bishop of Durham, issued a series of constitutions; and in the next year we meet with those of Ægidi de Bridport, bishop of Sarum; and about the same time with the synodal statutes of Walter and Simon, bishops of Norwich.[s]

We meet with various complaints from the bishops and clergy of this period relative to the papal exactions, from which it is evident that they did not readily submit to the Romish yoke. Yet the popes were crafty in their proceedings, never insisting upon a claim when they were too powerless to enforce it, but taking special care to introduce it or revive it at the most convenient season; and while they drained the rich of their wealth, they amused the ignorant poor with alleged miracles, relics, and the canonization of saints. St. Edmund, archbishop of Canterbury, was enrolled among the number at this time. Yet, after all, the popes were often opposed by the king and the clergy. In the year 1255 a council met at London under the legate, in which the demand for money was positively refused. In 1257 the legate made another attempt, which was probably successful; and the provincial synod of Canterbury met the same year at London. Though we know but little of the proceedings of these councils, yet, from the preceding notices, it will be seen that they were of frequent occurrence.[t]

An important council met at Merton, under the archbishop, in 1258,—important, because it appears to have been convened for the purpose of giving utterance to the complaints of the clergy and people. The pope had granted the king the tenths from the clergy, who resolved to resist

[s] Wilkins, i. 698, 699; Johnson, an. 1250; Spelman, ii. 290, 291, 302-304; Wilkins, i. 713, 720.

[t] Wilkins, i. 694-696, 709-712, 722-736; Spelman, ii. 293, 300.

the invasion of their rights. For this purpose the synod was convened by the archbishop, who sympathised with the clergy, knowing that the pontiff made the concession to the sovereign in the hope of being allowed to exact contributions for himself.[u]

In 1261 Archbishop Boniface issued a body of constitutions for the use of his province, which had probably been sanctioned in a synod at Lambeth. They shew the temper of the churchmen of those times, who appear to have been resolved to cast off the temporal authority altogether. Thus it is ordained, that bishops, who were summoned into the royal courts, should refuse to appear, "since no power is given to laymen to judge God's anointed." Bishops were even authorised to place their dioceses under an interdict, that the people might be absolved from obedience to their sovereigns. "These are the boldest constitutions that were ever made in an English convocation; nor would any king ever have been patient under such loads of reproach as were cast upon him by all orders of men, but Henry III. Nor would he probably have borne such attempts as these of the bishops, but that he was at present embarrassed with his barons."[v]

Councils were held by the legate in 1265, at Westminster and Northampton, to raise money for the pope; certain constitutions for discipline, and to secure the Church against the encroachments of the laity, were enacted. It appears that the clergy were represented by the archdeacons.[w]

Othobon, the papal legate, convened a council in 1268, at which a body of constitutions was drawn up, which are known under his name. These canons were of great authority in this and the subsequent ages.[x]

[u] Wilkins, i. 736, 740; Wake's Authority, 198.

[v] Johnson, an. 1261; Wilkins, i. 744-756; Spelman, ii. 305-315; Labb. et Coss. xi. 703-705, 803-815.

[w] Wilkins, i. 759-762; Collier, i. 468-471.

[x] Spelman, ii. 263-289; Labb. et Coss. xi. 866-907; Johnson, an. 1268;

In 1269 the clergy exhibited their complaints, in the provincial synod of Canterbury, against the exactions of the king and the recent attempts of the legate. The synod was convened for the purpose of granting a subsidy; and the occasion was embraced to state their grievances. Still, a grant was made to the crown. During the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, the bishops of the province met at Reading in 1271, to decide on the disputes between them and the chapter. The monks, as was their custom, appealed to the pope. In 1273 the new archbishop summoned his convocation to meet at St. Paul's.[y]

Peckham was now in the see of Canterbury; and in a provincial synod at Reading, in 1279, the constitutions of Othobon were read, after which the archbishop submitted to the council those canons which are still known under his own name. They are of the usual character of the constitutions of those times.[z] In a synod at Lambeth, in 1281, the canons of the previous council of Lyons and those of Lateran, A.D. 1216, were recited. By a decree of this synod it would seem that the doctrine of transubstantiation had now arrived at maturity. The following canon or rule was adopted:—"Let the bells be tolled at the elevation of the body of Christ, that the people, wherever they are, in houses or fields, may bow their knees, in order to have the

Collier, i. 474; Wilkins, ii. 1-19. They are placed by Spelman under the year 1248, by mistake. In one of the constitutions instructions are given for the administration of baptism in cases of necessity. The eucharist is said to be eaten for the quick and the dead.

[y] Wilkins, ii. 19-22, 24, 26, 27; Ang. Sac. i. 498. In 1276 the synodal constitutions of Robert bishop of Durham were published. Wilkins, ii. 28-30; Spelman, ii. 316-320.

[z] Spelman, ii. 320-7; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1062-70; Johnson, an. 1279. By one canon it is ordered that all persons should prostrate themselves before the host when it was carried to the sick by the priest, who was to be preceded by a light in a lantern and a bell, to warn the people of its approach. Prayers for the dead are mentioned; and at the death of a bishop an office was to be performed for his soul, and each priest was to say a mass for the expiation of the prelate's sins. A synod was held this same year at Pontefract, by the Archdeacon of Cleveland. Wilkins, ii. 41, 42.

indulgences." Communion in one kind also seems now to have been common, for the priests are instructed to inform the people that the body and blood of Christ are given them at once under the species of bread; "nay, the whole living and true Christ, who is entirely under the species of the sacrament: and let them at the same time instruct them, that what at the same time is given them to drink is not the sacrament, but mere wine, to be drunk for the more easy swallowing of the sacrament which they have taken." From this it is clear that the cup was at this time administered to the clergy only. Several reasons are assigned for the practice. *First*, lest the people should believe that the whole Christ was not contained under one species; *secondly*, lest the blood should be spilled; *thirdly*, because the people under the law did not partake of the drink-offering; *fourthly*, because it would be indecent to consecrate so large a quantity of wine as would be required in large parishes. The third constitution allows of *lay baptism*, and prohibits *rebaptization*.[a] Popery was now at its full growth in England, as is evident from these constitutions. A council had also been held at Lambeth in the preceding year, at which the legantine constitutions of Otho and Othobon were recited; and another was called in 1291, at London, to consider the question of the expulsion of the Jews, who at this period were generally subjected to the most cruel treatment from the Church.[b]

[a] Spelman, ii. 328-341; Wilkins, ii. 50-61; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1156-1174; Johnson, an. 1281; Collier, i. 480-484.

[b] Labb. et Coss. xi. 1124, 1360; Wilkins, ii. 180. Several synods were held at this period, which we can merely specify. Thus a provincial convocation met in 1283 at London; one at York in 1286; in the province of Canterbury in 1287. In 1290 the province of York met to grant a subsidy. These were called by the archbishops at the command of the sovereign, who issued his writ for that purpose. Wilkins, ii. 42, 93, 95, 126-128, 174. An important diocesan synod was held in 1287 at Exeter, at which a body of canons was issued. They are fifty-five in number. In 1289 the Bishops of Chichester and Oxford issued a series of canons for their dioceses, and the Bishop of Sodor and Man in 1291. These diocesan synods were held by the bishops to enforce the constitutions of the convocations of the provinces

Winchelsey, who became archbishop in 1292, following the practices of his predecessors, now published a body of constitutions for the regulation of the court belonging to the see of Canterbury. The king, however, sent a prohibition lest any thing should be decreed which might be prejudicial to the rights of the sovereign.[c] In 1296 a council was convened to consider the danger of the Church, after which an excommunication was denounced against those who should infringe the liberties granted by the king in the great charter.[d] At this period the commons were first summoned to parliament.[e] Prior to this reign the great men only had been called to the great council. The *premunitory* clause was now first inserted in the bishops' writs. It appears, therefore, that this was the first time of summoning the clergy to a national assembly by royal writ.

Winchelsey held a provincial synod at Merton in 1305,

in their dioceses. Wilkins, ii. 130-172, 175; Spelman, ii. 350-403, 404-411.

[c] Spelman, ii. 413-427; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1405-1421; Wake's Authority, 206; Wilkins, ii. 189, 190, 204-213.

[d] It appears that the synod met in 1297, when a contribution was granted to enable the king to repel an invasion of the Scots. The bishops, by the pope's bulls, were compelled to assemble the clergy to raise contributions for the king, who called them to parliament with the prelates, in order that they might make the necessary grant of money. They complied, however, with extreme reluctance. It is said that they had never been so summoned until now in 1298, except once in the year 1283. The clergy pleaded a bull against their taxation without the consent of the see of Rome. When they refused to obey the royal summons, time was granted for deliberation, after which they still persisted in their refusal. They were censured by the king; and then the archbishop, bishops, and clergy denounced an excommunication against such as seized the goods of the Church. Edward's government was very severe; but at length, being embarrassed, he made his peace with the Church. Johnson, an. 1298. Johnson says of Winchelsey's excommunications in 1298: "This is the first express instance which I have observed of the lower clergy's concurring with the bishops in ordaining any ecclesiastical matter, excepting what is mentioned by Boniface: Const. xxi. 1261." Johnson, an. 1298; Wilkins, ii. 242-253; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1421-1425. In 1295 the clergy were summoned to parliament for the first time by royal writ. Wilkins, ii. 215. The convocation of York met in 1297 for a subsidy. Ib. 235, 236.

[e] Wake's Authority, 232; Wilkins, ii. 240-242; Spelman, ii. 428-433.

in which certain synodal constitutions were formed relative to tithes, the repairs and furniture of churches, and other kindred matters.[f] Certain canons were issued also by the Archbishop of York, which had been agreed upon in a provincial council at Ripon, A.D. 1306. They relate to the morals of the clergy, celibacy, the clerical dress, and various other subjects.[g] In 1308 certain synodal constitutions were agreed upon in a synod at Winchester, relating especially to baptism, the seven sacraments, and other subjects affecting the clergy.[h] In 1309 a synod was convened by Winchelsey at London, which was attended by most of his suffragans, by the deans and proctors of chapters, and by the archdeacons and proctors of the parochial clergy, together with some of the clergy connected with the religious houses. This council was called by order of the pope, with a view to an inquiry into the conduct of the Knights Templars. The papal bull was read; mass was celebrated; and complaints or grievances were exhibited to the synod.[i] In the province of York certain constitutions were agreed upon in 1311, and published, relating chiefly to the ecclesiastical courts.[k] From this time then we find the clergy in parliamentary assemblies and in ecclesiastical convocations: to the former they were summoned by the præmunientes clause in the bishops' writs; to the latter by the archbishop

[f] Spelman, ii. 431-37. Labb. et Coss. xi. 1435-8; Johnson assigns them to the year 1305; Spelman to 1300. Wilkins, ii. 278-282.

[g] Spelman, ii. 439-445; Wilkins, ii. 285, 286.

[h] Spelman, ii. 445-458; Wilkins, ii. 293-301.

[i] Spelman, ii. 458-466; Wilkins, ii. 304-322; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1502-1512; Collier, i. 507. The pope issued various acts against the Templars, which were confirmed in a synod at York in 1310, and in Canterbury in 1311. Wilkins, ii. 329-401, 406.

[k] Wilkins, ii. 409-416; Spelman, ii. 467-475; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1502-1512. Richard bishop of Durham issued some diocesan constitutions in 1312. The second orders the diocesan synod to assemble twice in the year. Wilkins, ii. 416-418; Spelman, ii. 475-485. In 1313 a provincial synod met at York to grant a subsidy. Wilkins, ii. 436. In 1311 we find Winchelsey summoning the clergy to parliament on the authority of the royal writ. Ib. 408.

or the sovereign. In 1314 the archbishop was directed by royal writ to summon the clergy. The cathedral and diocesan clergy are specified, the latter to be represented by two proctors. To this summons the clergy raised various objections, regarding it as a violation of their privileges. The next year the clergy of Canterbury were summoned to a convocation to raise a subsidy for the expenses of the war with Scotland. This was repeated in 1316. Similar assemblies, and for the same object, were convened in the province of York. In the year 1318 the convocations met in both provinces, to grant subsidies for the Scottish war. Robert Bruce was denounced as a rebel by the pope's agent. Convocations for subsidies for this war were now almost annual. In 1321 the clergy were summoned to parliament for the usual purpose,—a subsidy. On these occasions the clergy met with the laity, for the purpose of taxation; but they frequently met *in convocation* during the same year for ecclesiastical purposes. Sometimes, indeed, after the parliamentary writ was introduced, they met in convocation for granting subsidies. They appear to have met in convocation this same year, as well as in parliament.[l]

In the year 1319 an inquiry was instituted into the alleged miracles of Archbishop Winchelsey, yet he was not canonized. So great was his estimation with the people, that they resorted in numbers to his tomb, which was pulled down some years after.[m]

Archbishop Reynolds summoned his provincial synod for Church purposes, A.D. 1322, at Oxford. Various constitutions were issued, which mark the progress of papal errors. Extreme unction is enjoined; the oil is to be carried to the sick with great reverence; and the words of St. James are quoted to prove its necessity as a sacrament. These canons are very similar to those of several previous

[l] Wilkins, ii. 442-445, 456-458, 462, 463, 485, 486, 506-508.
[m] Ibid. 486-490, 494, 495, 500.

archbishops, relating more especially to the mode of performing the offices of the Church. In this same year the clergy also met in the parliament, and it would seem that a convocation also assembled in London. At a meeting of the province of York the clergy sought to be relieved from the subsidy on the ground of poverty, promising that instead of money they would offer their prayers for the king. In 1323 a synod which had been summoned was suspended by the archbishop, probably at the request of the clergy. This appears to have been done in both provinces. In 1326 a singular case occurred. The archbishop summoned his convocation for a particular day; meanwhile the king convened his parliament, and ordered the metropolitan to suspend the synodical meeting. It was accordingly prorogued to another time by the archbishop.[n]

In a council under Archbishop Mepham, held at London, *Good Friday* was ordered to be observed as a holyday, to be spent "in reading with silence, in prayer with fasting, in compunction with tears." It was also ordained that the *Feast of the Conception* should be observed in the province of Canterbury.[o] These feasts, however, had long since been

[n] Ibid. 512-514; Johnson, an. 1322; Wilkins, ii. 515-517, 519, 520, 532-534.

[o] Spelman, ii. 493-496, 500-502; Labb et Coss. xi. 1784-1788, 2476-82; Wilkins, ii. 548, 552-554; Collier, i. 531, 532. Spelman places the council respecting feasts in 1328; Wilkins gives it in 1332. Wilkins, ii. 560, 561. The clergy were summoned to a parliamentary assembly for a subsidy, in 1327, at Leicester, and the next year at York. In the writs the diocesan clergy are mentioned. Wilkins, ii. 538, 539, 545, 546. The clergy met also in the parliament at Winchester, in obedience to the royal writ, in 1329; and in convocation at Lambeth in 1330. In 1331 the province of York assembled for granting subsidies. Wilkins, ii. 557-559. A grant was made in the year 1333 at Northampton and at York; and again in 1334 both provinces assembled to grant a subsidy,—at Westminster in 1335, and at Leicester in 1336. These were parliamentary assemblies. Both provinces met in 1337 in convocation, but under the royal writ, for state purposes. In 1338 both provinces were again assembled with the parliament, and in convocation in 1339. Thus on some occasions the clergy were summoned to par-

added to the list of holy days; but probably the people had been negligent in their observance. On no other ground can we account for these decrees so long after the days had been appointed to be kept holy.

liament, on others to their own convocations. These assemblies were different from those which were called by the bishops for Church objects. The king, however, could convene the synod for ecclesiastical purposes. Wilkins, ii. 561-563, 575, 576, 578, 581-583, 623, 625, 629, 653.

CHAPTER IV.

A.D. 1330-1532.

Canon Law — Councils in 1342, 1360 — Constitutions of Islip; of Sudbury — Councils against Wicliff and Lollardism — Synods under Archbishop Chicheley from 1415 to 1437 — Convocation of York — Councils in the reign of Henry VII. — Henry VIII. — A Legantine Council — Convocation, 1523 — The King recognised as Supreme Head of the Church.

Before we proceed in the narrative, it will be necessary to take some notice of the Pope's *Canon Law*, which was now completed and introduced into the English Church.

The *Canon Law* is contained in a volume under the title *Corpus Juris Canonici*, which consists of *rules* taken, in some instances, from Scripture, and from the writings of the fathers, of the ordinances of general and provincial councils, and of the decrees of popes. It is, however, divided into *Decrees* and *Decretals*, to which are added the *Clementines* and *Extravagants*. The *Decrees* are the most ancient. They were introduced into England about the year 1150: eighty years later the *Decretals*, consisting of the canonical epistles of several popes, issued for the determining of various questions, were received in this country; and in about seventy years more the *Clementines* and *Extravagants* were adopted.

The *Decrees*, consisting of rules gathered from Scripture, fathers, and councils, were corrected and reduced into their present state by Gratian. They were never received in the Eastern Church. The *Decretals*, comprised in three volumes, were arranged at different periods. They were published by different popes, until at length they were brought into the state in which they now stand in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*. The *Clementines* are of a

similar character. They were collected by Pope Clement V., and published by John XXII. under the above title. The *Extravagants* are twenty constitutions of John XXII., so called because they are not methodically arranged, but, as it is said, *vagantur extra corpus collectionum canonum.* Other *extravagants* were collected at a subsequent period; and these various documents constitute at the present moment the *canon law* of the Church of Rome.

This canon law was received in England, as the Church became subject to the usurpation of Rome; and it continued to be the law of the Church until the Reformation, and even now some parts of the old canon law are still in force in this country. It will be seen as we proceed, that by the Act of Submission in the 25th of Henry VIII. the canon law was confirmed, until some measures should be taken for its revision, provided it was not repugnant to the royal prerogative and the laws and customs of the kingdom. The revision, as will be noticed in a subsequent chapter, never took place; consequently some parts of the ancient canon law still remain in force.

In the fourteenth century the *canon law* was become very voluminous, and the chief business of our national and provincial synods was to enforce the papal decisions, or to extract from them certain rules for the regulation of the various dioceses. Some of the laws were not applicable to every country; consequently extracts from the body of the canon law were made from time to time by various archbishops and by the papal legates. Lyndwood made a collection of the *constitutions* drawn up by fourteen archbishops of Canterbury from the canon law, commencing with Stephen Langton, A.D. 1206, and ending with Henry Chicheley, A.D. 1443. These were digested by Lyndwood into different heads, according to the method of the canon law; so that his work shews how much, and what parts, were received in the Church of England previous to the Reformation. These constitutions had been sanctioned by various synods; and, though originally prepared for the

province of Canterbury, yet they were expressly received by the convocation of York A.D. 1463.

Such was the canon law as received in this country prior to the Reformation. Every thing was under the domination of the pope. The *Provincials* of Lyndwood indeed were not compiled until after the period now under review; but I have noticed them in this place in order that the subject may be dismissed.[a]

A convocation was held in the province of Canterbury in 1341, at which a body of constitutions was put forth relative to matters of government and discipline. In the year 1342 John Stratford, the archbishop, issued a large collection of statutes for the regulation of the ecclesiastical courts.[b] This year also a synod of the province of Canterbury was held at London, at which a large body of constitutions was sanctioned. By the *fourth*, lands are made liable for the repair of churches. It is clear, therefore, that the present possessors of lands cannot complain, inasmuch as they neither inherited nor purchased that portion which goes to the church in the shape of church-rates.[c] During the same, or the succeeding year, Archbishop Stratford convened a synod of his province in London. One of the constitutions, the *eleventh*, is remarkable, as referring to

[a] Corpus Juris Canonici, Paris, 1618; Lyndwood's Provinciale, seu Constitutiones Anglic. &c.; Ayliffe's Parergon Juris Canonici Anglicani, Introduction; Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 272, 273; Ridley's View of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Law, 98, &c.; Gibson's Codex. In the table he gives all the provincial and legantine constitutions in chronological order, with their various titles as they stand in Lyndwood. Grey's Ecclesiastical Law, 8-11; Godolphin's Repertorium, 129, and Appendix, 1-10; Dupin, xii. 204; Berington's History, ii. 367.

[b] A synod met also in the other province, and another under the royal writ for York and Canterbury in 1344 for a subsidy. In the next year also both the synods assembled for the same purpose, and again in Canterbury in 1346. In 1347 some constitutions agreed upon in a diocesan synod were put forth by the Bishop of Bath and Wells. Wilkins, ii. 711, 712, 727; Parker, 354; Wilkins, ii. 727, 728, 735-738.

[c] Spelman, ii. 572-580; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1877-86; Johnson, an. 1342; Wilkins, ii. 695-702.

the publication of banns previous to marriage. The rest partake of the general character of such documents as were common to the age.[d] "These canons are made and published under the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the advice and consent of the bishops of the province: and all without the least mention of the concurrence of the inferior clergy."[e] The omission of the mention of the clergy, however, does not necessarily imply their absence.[f]

Archbishop Zouche had published constitutions in the province of York, which were now confirmed in a provincial council under his successor, John Thursby. The *second* constitution regulates the management of new-born infants, and presents a somewhat curious picture of the manners of the times. Nurses and parents are prohibited from having young children in bed with them, lest suffocation should ensue. The *third* relates to *tithes,* and is a striking illustration of the feelings of our forefathers on this important subject. It refers especially to the mode of levying the *tithe* of corn, ordaining that the clergy should be allowed to remove the *tenth* sheaves by the same roads through which the rest were taken by the occupiers of the soil. It is stated in the constitution that this liberty had been enjoyed beyond the memory of man; but it is added that some degenerate sons of holy Mother Church, not considering the favour of God in giving them *nine* parts, had obstructed the clergy in divers manners by *malicious inventions,* such as compelling them to remove them by circuitous roads instead of the accustomed ones. Some of the owners of lands would not allow of the removal of the sheaves in sufficient time, and permitted them to be trampled upon by their cattle. All these things are prohibited by this constitution. The *fifth* relates to the cleri-

[d] Spelman, ii. 581-591; Labb. et Coss. xi. 1886-98; Johnson, an. 1343; Wilkins, ii. 702-710. Wilkins and Spelman place them under the same year with the preceding constitutions.

[e] Collier, i. 546.

[f] Wilkins, ii. 675-678; Spelman, ii. 488-492. Spelman misplaces them under the year 1321. Wilkins, ii. 680-695; Spelman, ii. 570-71.

cal dress, assigning as a reason for strict propriety, that the laity imitate the manners of the clergy. It is particularly added, that they are not to "seek glory from their shoes." The *seventh* relates to marriage, and ordains that banns should be published on three solemn days previous to the solemnisation.[g]

In these times we meet with frequent orders addressed to the archbishop to pray for the king. On such occasions the archbishop addressed his clergy on the subject. One specimen from Islip's constitution of 1359 may serve as an illustration: "Whereas the most excellent prince, our lord the king, is now going to make an expedition with his army for the recovery of his rights, &c., we, who have lived under his protection, are admonished to take ourselves to prayer."[h]

Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, issued some constitutions in 1362; and though it is not stated in the title that they were agreed upon in a council, yet it is mentioned in one of the canons that he acted with the advice and consent of his brethren: so that it is clear that they were settled in a provincial synod. The most remarkable is that which fixes the number of festivals on which persons were to abstain from labour. The solemnity of the dedication of every parish church is especially mentioned.

[g] Spelman, ii. 602-608; Johnson, an. 1347 and 1363; Labb. et Coss. xi. 2482-92; Wilkins, iii. 68-74. Spelman places them about the year 1360. In 1351 the convocations of both provinces met by royal writ for state purposes, though not as part of the parliament. Wilkins, iii. 16-18. In 1352 the *Articuli Clero* were put forth. Ib. 23-25. Both convocations again met for state purposes in 1355. Ib. 33-36. Archbishop Islip convened his convocation for church matters in 1356, in which year the other province also met to grant subsidies: and both again in 1357 and 1359. Ib. 38, 39, 41, 45, 46. The Bishop of Sodor issued some diocesan constitutions which had been agreed upon in a synod at Man in 1350. Wilkins, iii. 10, 11.

[h] Johnson, an. 1359; Wilkins, iii. 42, 43. We here see the origin of the practice of ordering particular forms of fasting and thanksgiving. In the year 1361 the archbishop, at the command of the pope, assembled the bishops alone to meet him at St. Mary's, Southwark, on business connected with the papal see. Wilkins, iii. 47, 48.

It may here be remarked that this is the origin of our *feasts* or *wakes*.[i] A synod was held in 1375, which is remarkable from the circumstance that Courteney, then bishop of Hereford, successfully opposed the proposal of a grant of money to the king. The clergy complained, and Courteney defended their cause, refusing to make any grant until the king would remedy the evils under which they suffered.[j] A synod was assembled by royal writ for the province of Canterbury in 1376, when a subsidy was granted; yet still the clergy presented their complaints in a petition.

About this time John Wicliff was summoned to answer the charge of heresy alleged against him by his enemies. Into his history I need not enter: I have only to notice the proceedings of convocation respecting him and his opinions. The pope directed his letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury, commanding him to institute a process against Wicliff, who was also summoned to appear at Rome. He was accordingly cited before the synod in London. A vast concourse of people assembled at the meeting, among whom was the Duke of Lancaster, who defended Wicliff. In consequence of this powerful support, the only sentence passed by the synod was that of silence. At a subsequent synod at Lambeth, after an explanation of some of his views, he was dismissed with a similar injunction to silence.[k]

In 1378, several constitutions were agreed upon in a synod at Lambeth, under Archbishop Sudbury, the object

[i] Spelman, ii. 609-612; Johnson, an. 1362; Wilkins, iii. 50, 51. A convocation appears to have assembled in the province of Canterbury in 1363; and we have an account of a diocesan synod at Ely in 1364. Wilkins, iii. 59, 60. The convocation of Canterbury met under Wittlesey in 1369 to grant subsidies, and that of York for the same purpose; and again in 1371. Canterbury was also assembled for the same purpose in 1373. Ib. 82, 84, 85, 91-93, 96.

[j] Biog. Brit. art. Courteney; Wilkins, iii. 97, 104. Both convocations met in 1377. Ib. 114, 122, 125, 126; Parker, 180.

[k] Spelman, ii. 621-625; Collier, i. 565-567; Wilkins, iii. 116, 117, 123.

of which appears to have been the regulation of the price to be received by the priests in performing masses for the dead.[l]

The opinions of Wicliff continued to advance among the people, and the bishops deemed it necessary to interpose. Accordingly Courteney, Archbishop of Canterbury, summoned a meeting of his suffragans and others, by whom some of Wicliff's views were pronounced to be erroneous and heretical. Nine points were, it appears, selected as heretical, referring to the *sacrament of the altar*, the papal succession, and various abuses of the Romish church. Twelve other points were condemned, not as heretical, but as erroneous. At a subsequent meeting, or synod, several persons were condemned for holding the views of Wicliff.[m] A convocation was convened by the archbishop in the year 1382, at Oxford, in which, besides the grant of a subsidy, the synod proceeded to make inquiries respecting heresy.[n] A provincial synod was held in 1391 to make a grant to the pope, when a statute of Archbishop Winchelsey's, concerning stipendiary priests, was renewed.[o]

Lollardism, as it was termed, continuing to increase, the synod, or convocation, of the province of Canterbury, assembled at Oxford in 1394 for the purpose of endeavouring to check its progress, and again at London in 1396, in

[l] Spelman, ii. 626; Labb. et Coss. xi. 2051; Johnson, an. 1378; Wilkins, iii. 135, 136. Sudbury called his convocation together in 1379 to reform some abuses, and to assist the king. The usual subsidy also was granted at York; and both made a grant in the year 1380. Ib. 141, 142, 145, 150.

[m] Spelman, ii. 629-636; Labb. et Coss. xi. 2052-2061; Collier, i. 573-576; Biog. Brit. art. Courteney; Wilkins, iii. 157-165.

[n] Collier, i. 578; Biog. Brit. art. Courteney; Wood's Antiq. 192-3; Wilkins, iii. 172, 173. York met also. Ib. Canterbury was convened in 1383 for a subsidy; and again in 1384 both provinces were assembled. Both again met in 1385. These, however, were convocations, though assembled for purposes of state. Ib. 176, 179, 185, 193, 194. In 1386, 1387, and 1388 similar synods met in both provinces. Ib. 200, 202, 204, 205.

[o] Spelman, ii. 640; Johnson, an. 1391; Biog. Brit. art. Courteney; Wilkins, iii. 212, 213, 218-224. A subsidy was granted at York in the same year; and the synods met in both provinces in 1392. Ib.

which several articles, extracted from the writings of Wicliff, were condemned.[p] Archbishop Arundel convened a council at London in 1398, in which several new festivals were appointed to be observed, namely, those of St. David, St. Chad, and St. Winifrede. It was also appointed that "a commemoration of the most glorious martyr St. Thomas be laudably observed every where in our province of Canterbury, once in every week."[q] In the year 1400 an important synod was held at St. Paul's, at which complaints of heresy and conventicles were submitted to the bishops and clergy. The articles charged against William Sawtrey were exhibited and then condemned. Two years later the Lollards were complained of in the convocation, when a petition to the king on the subject was adopted.[r]

Certain constitutions which had been adopted in the synod of Oxford in 1394 were renewed in London in 1408. Thirteen constitutions exist, which are levelled against heretics, and especially against Wicliff. We find that repeated attempts were made in this and the succeeding age to suppress the advancing opinions of Wicliff, who has been not inaptly styled the morning-star of the Reformation.[s]

The convocation appears to have assumed its present form about this time. The archbishops, or legates, assembled provincial or national councils; but the king also claimed the power of assembling the convocation.[t] From the reign of Edward I., when the Commons were first assembled in parliament, it became the practice [to summon] the convocation of the clergy at the same time.[u]

Another was convened in 1408, for the purpose of

[p] Spelman, ii 649-55; Collier, i. 600. In 1397 both synods met to grant a subsidy to the king and the pope. Wilkins, iii. 284.

[q] Johnson, an. 1398.

[r] Wilkins, iii. 254-263, 271, 272.

[s] Spelman, ii. 662-668; Johnson, an. 1408; Collier, i. 625-27; Labb. et Coss. xi. 2089-3002. Various synods were held as usual at this period in both provinces for subsidies, as in the years 1401-1406; Labb. et Coss. xi. 2082-83; Wilkins, iii. 267, 273, 274, 279, 281, 282, 284, 303.

[t] Wake's Authority, 230: Fuller, v. 190.

[u] Wake's Authority, 224-231.

choosing delegates to attend the council, which was shortly to be assembled at Pisa, and to consider the schism in the papacy. The archbishop proposed that the *Peter-pence* should be sequestrated for the use of the king, until the breach should be healed. The proposal was also sanctioned by the convocation.[v] In a convocation at St. Paul's, in 1409, Badby was examined on a charge of heresy; and many complaints were exhibited on the same subject.[w] Complaints of heresy were alleged in a synod in 1411. It was assembled for a subsidy; but advantage was taken to introduce the subject of heresy. At this time such complaints were frequent. In 1412 we meet with the same in a synod at St. Paul's: and again at the same place in 1413, when charges were exhibited against Sir John Oldcastle. In 1414 it was determined, in a synod at St. Paul's and also at York, to send representatives to the general council of Constance; and a certain sum was granted for their expenses.[x]

The proceedings in the national and provincial synods are so many landmarks by which the advances of the papacy in England may be traced. At this time much stress was laid on the observance of times and seasons. The king, it seems, had recommended that St. George's Day should be kept with greater solemnity. Archbishop Chicheley therefore called a synod of his province, by which several constitutions were issued on the subject. After an allusion to the blessings supposed to be derived from patron saints, we have the following passage in the constitutions: "Upon consideration of this, the faithful people of England, though bound to praise God in all his saints, yet especially to sound forth praises and venerate him with peculiar honours in his

[v] Collier, i. 628; Wilkins, iii. 306-314. The convocation of York met this year for a subsidy by continuation, because they could not raise it at the former meeting. Ib. 319.

[w] Wilkins, iii. 324-329. The Archbishop of York appointed commissaries to act this year on his behalf in the convocation, in consequence of his visitation. Ib.

[x] Wilkins, iii. 334-338, 351-357, 358, 370. Subsidies were also granted in other councils.

most glorious martyr the blessed George, the special patron and protector of the nation, as the speech of the world and the experience of grace (the best interpreter of all things) attest. For by his intervention, not only the English army is protected against the assaults of enemies in time of war, but the host of the clergy are strengthened in their peaceable fight under so great a patron." The constitutions proceed to enact that the day shall be observed for ever with greater solemnity. The feasts of St. David, St. Chad, and St. Winifrede are also ordered to be perpetually celebrated.[y] In this convocation it appears that the bishops met in one place, and the priors, deans, archdeacons, and proctors of dioceses in another. They met on the first day for religious observances, and on the following separated into two houses. This is one of the earliest notices of their separation into two distinct houses.[z]

Another synod met in London in 1416. In this assembly a statute was framed respecting the probate and administration of wills, and another on the subject of heresy. With respect to heresy it is ordained, that inquiries be made on the subject twice every year at least, and that two or three persons in every suspected place should be sworn to give information respecting those who were accustomed to frequent conventicles, or who differed in their conduct from the generality of the faithful, or had suspected books in the vulgar tongue. It further enjoins that persons already convicted, but not actually given over to the secular power according to the statute of Henry IV., should be imprisoned for life, or until the next convocation of the province of Canterbury, as the case might require.[a] In another constitution of a synod in the same year, we

[y] Spelman, ii. 669; Johnson, an. 1415; Wilkins, iii. 375, 377. The archbishop issued a letter on the subject; but he alludes to his Provincial Council. Another letter also was published relative to the expenses of the representatives at the Council of Constance. Ib.

[z] Biog. Brit. art. Chicheley.

[a] Spelman, ii. 670; Wilkins, iii. 377, 378.

meet with a most remarkable illustration of the gross superstition of the period. It relates to John of Beverley, a Saxon saint, some of whose miracles are specified by Bede.[b] After an enumeration of some of the special advantages arising from the merits of the saints, the victory of Agincourt is ascribed to John of Beverley. John was buried at York, but the body was removed to Beverley, the day of the translation being observed as a festival. The victory at Agincourt was gained on this day, and at the meeting of the convocation several witnesses affirmed that during the battle his tomb distilled drops of oil. This circumstance was regarded by the convocation "as an indication of the divine mercy, without doubt through the merits of the said most holy man." It was decreed, therefore, that the day of his death as well as that of his translation should be solemnly observed.[c]

Several synods were assembled by Chicheley, who was exceedingly active in his station. In a convocation of the province of Canterbury in 1421, a charge of heresy was exhibited against William Taylor. It was resumed in the next year, and discussed at great length. William White and other followers of Wicliff were examined on the same charge. In this convocation also delegates were appointed to attend the council of Pavia. John Russell was charged in the convocation of Canterbury in 1424 with the maintenance of erroneous opinions. He had been sent to the convocation from the diocese of Lincoln. Several other individuals appeared for similar offences.

In 1425 the synod of Canterbury was continued from day to day for a considerable time. The Bishop of Bath and Wells came to the convocation on the king's business,

[b] Bede, lib. v. c. 2.

[c] Spelman, ii. 672-674; Johnson, an. 1416; Biog. Brit. art. Chicheley; Wilkins, iii. 379, 380; Parker, 415. At this same council they consulted about sending delegates to the Council of Constance, and again in 1419. Several persons in the latter year were charged with heresy. Wilkins, iii. 393-395.

namely, a subsidy: but the question of heresy was also discussed. Robert Hoke made his recantation, confessing that on Good Friday he had not paid the usual reverence to the cross, and that he had not submitted to the penance enjoined by the Bishop of Lincoln. On this account he was brought before the convocation, when he confessed that he had kept heretical books which deserved to be burned. He promised for the future not to preach erroneous doctrines. A form of recantation was also drawn up for William Russell for preaching that tithes were not due by the divine law. In 1426 the convocation of York was occupied with a case of heresy which had been alleged against Thomas Richmond.

In 1428 the papal legate complained to the convocation of the Bohemian heretics; and the subject was entertained by the synod. Other persons were charged with heresy; and some recanted before the convocation. At all these synods subsidies were granted to the king; and in the province of York little other business was transacted.[d]

In that of 1428 the pope's nuncio endeavoured to procure a grant for the pope; but the proposal was rejected.[e] As the convocation was so ready to grant subsidies to the sovereign, they were rewarded by an Act of Parliament, by which they were protected in going to and returning from the synod.[f]

The convocation of 1428 was continued until the next year, when the case of the Bohemians was again considered. A discussion also took place, on the proposal to send delegates to the council of Pisa though at this time the convocation had no certain knowledge of its proceedings. Thomas

[d] Wilkins, iii. 399-403, 404-413, 419, 422, 428-431, 433-453, 459-462, 487-492, 514. In the year 1416 the synod of York met, and was continued several days. Ib. 380. Both provinces met in 1417 to grant a subsidy; and again in 1421, when a grant was made to assist the king in the war with France. Ib. 381, 389, 399.

[e] Spelman, ii. 675-677; Wilkins, iii. 493, 503; Labb. et Coss. xii. 343; Collier, 648; Biog. Brit. art. Chicheley.

[f] This is the statute of Henry VI. Gibson's Codex, 931.

Bagley was charged with heresy for saying that the consecrated host was in its nature true bread, and the body of Christ only in a figure. As no conclusions were arrived at either about the council of Pisa, or a subsidy, the convocation was continued until March.[g]

In 1429 or 1430 a council was summoned for the purpose of choosing delegates to attend the council of Basil, in which a decree was also passed against what was termed the *auncel*, or false weights.[h] The archbishop convened his synod in London, in 1432, to consider the dispute between the pope and the council of Basil, when it was determined to send delegates to both parties. A complaint was made in this council by some of the clergy against the bishops, on the ground that they were but slenderly qualified for their important posts.[i] The next year, the differences between the council of Basil and the pope still continuing, it was determined in a synod to send more delegates to Basil.[j] In 1434 a festival was ordered by another council to be observed in honour of St. Frideswide.[k] Both convocations were assembled in 1437 for subsidies towards the war with France; and in 1438 an allowance was voted by the Bishops for the ambassadors to be sent to the council of Ferara by the king, which was opposed by the Lower House in the province of Canterbury, who were favourable to the council of Basil.[l] The next year, the archbishop lamented the state of the Church on account of the statute

[g] Wilkins, iii. 515-17. This year we meet with some diocesan constitutions of the Bishop of Lichfield. Ib. 504-507.

[h] Spelman, ii. 687, 688; Johnson, an. 1430; Collier, i. 658; Labb. et Coss. xii. 439, 440; Biog. Brit. art. Chicheley.

[i] Collier, i. 660; Wilkins, iii. 520, 521.

[j] Wilkins, iii. 521. Some cases of heresy also were discussed.

[k] Johnson, an. 1434. In this council the clergy complained of the secular courts; but the plague breaking out, they speedily separated. Articles were prepared and ordered to be read in churches several times a year. One of these relates to the auncel weight, which is placed earlier by some authorities. Wilkins, iii. 523, 524.

[l] Wilkins, iii. 525-528. In 1535 and 1536 the two synods met for subsidies. Ib. 525; Johnson, an. 1439.

of præmunire, when the synod agreed that he should represent their grievances to the king, who promised to submit the case to parliament. They then granted a large subsidy.[m]

A synod was held in 1444 in the province of York, in which a constitution of Archbishop Winchelsey's respecting stipendiary priests was adopted.[n] The next year Archbishop Stafford summoned the convocation of his province, when the *feast* of King Edward the Confessor was renewed. In allusion to the saints the following passage occurs in the decisions of the council: "At whose intercession God confirms peace, takes away pestilence and famine, establishes kingdoms and gives victories, and very often by a miraculous power imparts health to desperate diseases." Then after stating that every church is bound to honour its own saints, the decree proceeds: "Therefore that the divine majesty may be more amply glorified in the saints in our holy mother the Church of England, which is irradiated by the prayers and frequent miracles of the most blessed Edward, confessor and king, and by whose merits histories say the kingdom of England was formerly delivered from the cruelty of Pagans; we with the unanimous consent of our brethren in our last convocation, and also at the repeated instances of our most devout and Christian king (who doubts not but that his kingdom is defended by the intercession and patronage of this most glorious king and confessor), have decreed that the feast of the translation of the said St. Edward be celebrated throughout our province of Canterbury every year for the future." This extract may be taken as a proof that the Anglican Church at this time was in a sad and degraded state.[o]

[m] Wilkins, iii. 533-535. In 1440, 1441, and 1442, subsidies were granted by the two convocations. Ib. 536, 537.

[n] Johnson, an. 1444; Wilkins, iii. 544.

[o] Johnson, an. 1445; Wilkins, iii. 539-541. The archbishop assigned the reasons for assembling the convocation, namely, the royal writ, the reformation of some things in the Church, and a subsidy. The royal delegates

The convocation of Canterbury assembled in 1446 to discuss the question relative to the statute of *provisors* and *præmunire*, which pressed heavily upon the clergy.[p] In the year 1452 the convocation readily granted a subsidy to the king, but refused to do the same for the pope, though requested by the nuncio.[q]

In 1460 a convocation met at St. Paul's, which was continued by various prorogations till 1461. Articles, embodying certain complaints, were exhibited, the archbishop promising to give the subject his consideration. He also read a letter from the king, which was ordered to be sent down to the Lower House. A subsidy was afterwards granted.[r] A convocation met in the province of York A.D. 1462, and decreed that such constitutions of the province of Canterbury as were not prejudicial to those of York should be received and adopted.[s] "Thus the ancient churches observed one another's rules, without pretending thereby to any superiority over each other by their so doing, to preserve the unity and promote the good order and discipline of the whole."[t] At another meeting of the synod the feasts of St. Thomas, St. Frideswide, and St. Ethelrede were appointed to be observed.[u]

In 1463 Archbishop Bourchier assembled the convocation of Canterbury at London. Civil officers were restrained by a constitution from arresting persons in churches

stated their master's case, and the king requested the synod to attend to the processions which were to be appointed in consequence of the peace with France, and to declare St. Edward's Day to be a double festival. Complaints were made of the statute of præmunire, and some *reformanda* were proposed.

[p] A subsidy was granted this year, and again in 1449 and 1450. Wilkins, iii. 554, 557, 559; Collier, i. 669.

[q] Wilkins, iii. 562, 563; Collier, i. 672, 673. In 1453 a diocesan synod met at York, and granted a subsidy. Wilkins, iii. 564.

[r] Wilkins, iii. 577, 578. The convocation of York also granted a subsidy after divers prorogations. Ib.

[s] Johnson, an. 1462; Wake's State of the Church, 375; Atterbury, 47; Wilkins, iii. 578. Canterbury met the same year. Ib.

[t] Wake's State of the Church, 376. [u] Ibid.

or churchyards; and by another it was decreed that no clerk in holy orders should wear any gown or upper garment open in front, or with a border of fur. The servants of the bishops and dignitaries were also prohibited from wearing *bolsters* about their shoulders, or shoes turned up at the toes and very long. This decree affords an odd picture of the manners of the times.[v]

The pope expressed his intention, A.D. 1464, of going in person against the Turks, who held the Holy Land; and for this purpose money was solicited. The king, fearing that a synodical grant might afterwards become a precedent, sent a letter to the archbishops to excite their suffragans to raise money, that so the execution of the papal bulls might be prevented. Hence diocesan synods were held at Canterbury, Worcester, York, and probably in other dioceses, at which money was contributed, and thus the matter was not submitted to convocation.[w] In 1466 Nevil, archbishop of York, called the synod of his province together, when certain constitutions were sanctioned, some of which were taken from those of Canterbury.[x]

It should be observed, that subsidies were granted to the crown in all these synods; and at the period now under review little else was transacted in the convocations, which, however, were not convened so frequently as had been the case previously.[y] The infrequent assembling of the convocation may have arisen from the suppression of Wicliff's doctrines, or from the circumstance that subsidies were not required by the crown.[z]

[v] Spelman, ii. 698, 699; Johnson, an. 1463; Labb. et Coss. xiii. 1419-1421; Wilkins, iii. 585-587. York granted a subsidy. In the royal writ no time of meeting was fixed, but the archbishop was to assemble the synod with all convenient speed.

[w] Wilkins, iii. 595-598.

[x] Spelman, ii. 699-708; Johnson, an. 1466; Labb. et Coss. xiii. 1421-1434; Wilkins, iii. 595, 605.

[y] Wake's State, 378-384.

[z] Several meetings of the convocation of both provinces occurred at this period, in which little was transacted beyond the grant of subsidies. Thus

Henry VII. commenced his reign A.D. 1485; and Archbishop Morton assembled the convocation of his province at London the following year. By this synod prayers for the dead were established in a decree: "Because, according to the Holy Scripture, a concern for the dead is holy and wholesome, we ordain that when any bishop dies, every bishop of the province be bound to say, by himself, or by some other, the *Exequies* and six masses for the soul of the deceased bishop."[a] An order was issued respecting habits, and for the Feast of the Transfiguration.[b] The province of York also had their convocation, and granted a subsidy. In a convocation in 1488, at London, certain preachers were reprimanded for speaking too freely of their bishops; and a rebuke was administered to the London clergy for frequenting public-houses, and appearing too expensive in their dress.[c]

The remaining convocations of this reign were chiefly occupied in granting subsidies. Frequently, though not necessarily, they were assembled at the same time with the Parliament. In the province of York, 1488, by a decree of convocation, the Feast of the Transfiguration was

we find meetings in 1468 at St. Paul's; in both provinces in 1470, 1471, 1473, 1474, and 1475. In the last year church matters were discussed in the convocation of Canterbury, and certain articles relative to discipline were presented. The synod again met at York in 1477, and at St. Paul's, for subsidies only. Wilkins, iii. 606-609, 612. In 1480, at St. Paul's, besides the grant of a subsidy, church matters were discussed, and the prolocutor exhibited certain grievances to the upper house relative to the temporal courts. This convocation was continued from March to November, and then to May 1482. In 1483 a supplication was presented to the king respecting the liberties of the Church. Ib. 612-614.

[a] Spelman, ii. 712; Labb. et Coss. xiii. 1466; Wilkins, iii. 618, 620.

[b] Wake's State, 384; Wilkins, iii. 620.

[c] Collier, i. 692. The synod met in January, and was continued until October. Several persons were summoned before the assembly for having contracted irregular marriages. Money was demanded by the king in consequence of the war with France. A similar demand was made in the synod at York. A subsidy was granted in both provinces in 1491; by York in 495, and by Canterbury against the Scots in 1496; and again at York in 1497. Wilkins, ii. 625, 626, 634, 635, 644, 645.

appointed to be held on the 6th of August, that of the Name of Jesus on the 7th, and the Feast of the Dedication of all Churches to be observed on one and the same day, which was fixed on the Sunday after the Feast of St. Paul.[d] In 1501 the convocation of Canterbury met by command of the king, for the purpose of considering a proposal for a grant of money to the pope, who had imposed a tax of a *tenth* on the whole Christian Church, in defence of the faith against the Turks, who at that time were in the height of their success. The grant was made both in Canterbury and York.[e] The following singular decree was also passed in the convocation of Canterbury in the year 1503: "That for certain causes and considerations then expressed, the most excellent prince, our lord King Henry, in every principal mass at the high altar in all churches of the kingdom, where the clerks were more than thirteen, should have a part in all their prayers and suffrages, both for his safety and prosperity in this life, and also for his welfare after he had departed this life." A similar decree was issued by the convocation of York in 1504.[f] This is one of the earliest intimations of prayers for the sovereign in the regular services of the Anglican Church. The last synod of this reign was convened at York A.D. 1507, for church purposes only, by the archbishop's authority.[g]

Henry VIII. commenced his reign A.D. 1509. The convocation also met; and on one occasion the House of Lords was adjourned for a few days, in consequence of the absence of the chancellor and spiritual lords in convocation. This appears to have been the first instance of such a practice, though it became common afterwards.[h]

[d] Wake's State, 385. [e] Ibid. 388; Wilkins, iii. 646.

[f] Wake's State, 388, 389; Wilkins, iii. 647-649.

[g] Wake's State, 389; Wilkins, iii. 651. Warham also issued his constitutions in 1507 for the regulation of his court. Ib. 650, 651.

[h] Wake's State, 389. Warham issued his mandate for the synod. Wilkins, iii. 651; Burnet, iii. 1, b. 1.

During several years, the convocation, in both provinces, only assembled for the purpose of granting subsidies to the crown.[i] In 1518 a legantine council was summoned by Wolsey, as *legate a latere* from the pope.[j] It was a council of the whole kingdom, the archbishops and bishops of both provinces being present. But the circumstances are curious. Warham intended to call his provincial synod together, having obtained the king's consent, and being anxious to rectify certain abuses; but Wolsey addressed a letter to the archbishop against holding his convocation, and then convened his legantine synod at Westminster, at which certain articles were adopted, to be published by the bishops in their respective sees. The Bishop of Hereford held his diocesan synod that year for this purpose.[k] King Henry issued his writs in 1523 for the assembling of the convocation in both provinces. Wolsey, as archbishop of York, summoned the synod of his province to the usual place of meeting, and then adjourned them to Westminster. The province of Canterbury met a few days after the meeting of Parliament. After mass, a monition was sent by Wolsey to Warham to appear with

[i] In 1511 Colet preached his celebrated sermon before the convocation, in which he dwelt largely on the reformation of abuses. Knight's Life of Colet, 86-94; Burnet, iii. 1, book 2; Wood's Athenæ, i. 22; Bale, cent. viii. 648, 649; Wharton de Episcopis, &c. 232-237. The sermon was printed by Pynson. In 1661 it was republished by Smith, with a preface and notes.

[j] Wake's State, 394. Several meetings are recorded during the next few years. In 1512 at York, in 1514 in both provinces. In 1515 at St. Paul's, and at York in 1516. Wilkins, iii. 652, 657-659.

[k] Wilkins, iii. 660, 661, 681, 682. Certain constitutions of Thomas, archbishop of York and legate, exist, which are supposed to have been put forth about the year 1518; though this is not certain, as three archbishops of the same name held the see of York within the space of twenty years. Ib. 662-681. In 1521 a diocesan synod was held at Ely, at which a clergyman prayed to be absolved from an excommunication which had been imposed at the last synod. Ib. 693. This same year the question of clerical celibacy was discussed in convocation. Harmer's Specimen, App. 168, 169; Wilkins, iii. 696, 697.

his clergy before the cardinal at Westminster two days after, in a legantine or national council. It has been much debated whether the cardinal virtually dissolved the regular convocation, or only summoned them to appear before him, allowing them to adjourn afterwards to their own house. The former view is maintained by Wake, the latter by Atterbury. Collier agrees with Wake. The clergy objected, and returned back to St. Paul's to their own council, having no commission to treat of matters in the legantine synod. Burnet had stated that Wolsey dissolved the regular convocation of the province. Wake thinks, that though not a formal dissolution, it was so in effect, since there was a suspension of all their proceedings. After a short space, however, the legantine synod was dismissed, and the convocations in the two provinces assembled as before, and granted the usual subsidies to the crown.[l] Collier states that a large grant was proposed in the legantine council to the king, which, though opposed as exorbitant by some of the clergy, was carried by the influence of Wolsey.[m]

The convocation of Canterbury met in the usual way in 1529. It does not appear that the synod of York was assembled this year at all, for Wolsey was in disgrace. At this time great deliberations took place in the synod of Canterbury respecting the abuses in the Church, and an order was made that no member should reveal out of doors any thing that took place in their meetings. When the convocation met in 1529, the question of the divorce was agitating the public mind. The reader is aware of the important results which flowed from the discussion of that question: and it is unnecessary to enter into the particulars in this work.[n]

[l] Wake's State, 392-396; Collier, ii. 17; Strype's Memorials, vol. i. part 1, pp. 76, 77; Burnet, i. b. 1, and iii. b. 1; Wilkins, iii. 690-700.

[m] Collier, ii. 18. The grant, however, appears to have been made in the provincial synods. Certain diocesan statutes were issued in the diocese of Ely in 1528. Wilkins, iii. 712; Spelman, ii 729-731.

[n] The reformation of abuses was discussed, and certain heretical books

This was the last convocation of this period; for though assembled in 1529, it was continued by various prorogations until the submission of the clergy. In January 1530 its meetings were resumed. The clergy were now pronounced to be under the penalties of a præmunire with Wolsey, he for acting as legate, and they for submitting to his authority. Henry was resolved to take advantage of these circumstances to reduce them to submission, by levying a heavy tax, as well as by compelling them to recognise his supremacy. Thus, in February, in the form in which the subsidy was to be voted, the title of *supreme head* was inserted. The archbishop, having consulted with the royal delegates, began to treat with the prolocutor and clergy about the articles contained in the preamble to the subsidiary grant. One was thus expressed: "Ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani, cujus protector et supremum caput is solus est." Another related to the general pardon for all their offences against the laws, which was to be granted on their recognition of the new title, and the payment of the money. The latter article was readily conceded; but the royal agents had no power to conclude the business until the bishops and clergy had decided on the former. Several sessions were occupied in discussions. A modification was desired; and at last the king altered it thus: "cujus protector et supremum caput post Deum is solus est." Still they hesitated. The archbishop proposed the following form: "Ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani, cujus singularem protectorem unicum et supremum dominum, et (quantum per Christi legem licet) etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem cognoscimus." This form was adopted by both houses; but Henry was resolved to force them to submit. At last the matter was compromised, and the king was acknowledged as supreme head of the Church of England. The convocation of Canterbury consented to pay 100,000*l.*, and

were referred for further consideration. Certain statutes, without date, are assigned by Wilkins to this year, on the ground that heresy and heretical books are mentioned in one of them. Wilkins, iii. 717-24.

York 18,000*l.* to the king for their pardon, which was confirmed by Act of Parliament. The convocation of York, however, did not consent to the king's title until after the parliament had separated; and consequently their pardon was not confirmed until the next year. The see was vacant by the death of Wolsey, but the royal writ was issued to the guardian of the spiritualities. The synod was continued until May 1531, when they made their submission and were pardoned. Thus the recognition of the supremacy was made in Canterbury in 1530, in York in 1531.[o] It appears that during the debates on the title seven or eight messages were sent from the king by noblemen and lawyers. After three days the king added the words *post Deum:* then came the words *quantum* &c., in which form it was passed.

The doctrines of Rome, however, were retained in all their vigour, notwithstanding the proceedings adopted against the power of the pope, of which a singular instance was given in the present convocation. An individual of the name of Tracey had in his will committed his soul to God through Christ, to whose intercession he stated that he trusted, without the help of any other saint. The sub-

[o] Wilkins, 724-726, 744, 745; Strype's Cranmer, 1041, 1042; Fuller, v. (184); Wake's State, &c. 397, 398, 473, 474, 490; Atterbury, 82, 83, 85; Collier, ii. 63-65; Lingard, vi. 227. York being vacant, the opposition to the title was led by Tunstall. Godwin's Annals, 119. "The king made them buckle at last. It was another high block and difficulty for the clergy to get over, &c. to acknowledge the king supreme head and governor, &c. But that at last they unwillingly yielded unto." Strype's Mem. I. i. 204. "Being caught in a præmunire, they were willing to redeem their danger by a sum of money; but the king would not be satisfied unless they would acknowledge him for the supreme head of the Church of England, which, though it was hard meat, and would not easily down amongst them, yet it passed at last." Heylin's Tracts, 5. "The grant of the subsidy, as to the money, appears to have passed the convocation quickly and easily; but the king refused to accept the gift or grant the pardon unless after the words 'Ecclesiæ et cleri,' &c. they would add, 'Cujus protector et supremum caput is solus est.'" Gibson's Codex, 23, 24. The clergy were anxious for the king to accept the subsidy without the clause.

ject was discussed in convocation, and the body of the person was ordered to be disinterred, when it was committed to the flames. Still, a most important step was taken towards a separation from Rome. In the year 1531, the convocation of Canterbury met by continuation, when the question of heresy occupied its attention. Some constitutions for the reformation of the manners of the clergy were read; and Latimer was required to subscribe certain articles. He was, it appears, excommunicated: but on his subsequent submission, the sentence was removed.[p]

"By these arts, degrees, and accessions, the Church of Rome grew by little and little to that immenseness of opinion and power it had in our nation. But that which hath made the disputes never to be ended, the parties not to be reconciled, is an affirmation that Christ commanding Peter to feed his sheep, did with that give him so absolute a power in the Church (and derived the like to his successors, bishops of Rome), as without his consent no particular Church or kingdom could reform itself. And though no other Church in the Christian world doth agree with the Roman in this interpretation; though historians of unquestioned sincerity have in their own ages delivered when and how these additions crept in, and by what oppositions gained; yet the bare affirmation that Christ intended Peter, and by consequence the pope, to be the general pastor of the world, hath so far prevailed with some as to esteem the standing for the rights of the kingdom, the laws and customs of the nation, to be a departing from the Church Catholic."[q]

[p] Tenison Mss. vol. 751, pp. 73, 85; Wilkins, iii. 746, 747; Strype's Cranmer, i. 198, 199, 255; Stowe, 779; Strype's Mem. I. i. 248-251; Collier, ii. 75. When Tracey's will was proved, it was pronounced to be heretical, because he had expressed his trust in the merits of Christ alone. Bilney also was charged with erroneous opinions in this convocation. A complaint was made of a will made by a person of the name of Brown, in Bristol. The convocation of York granted a subsidy this year. Wilkins, iii. 748.

[q] Twisden's Historical Vindication of the Church of England in point of Schism, 4to, 1675, pp. 64, 65, 67.

CHAPTER V.

A.D. 1532-1534.

State of the Convocation at this time — Steps by which the submission of the Clergy was procured — The Act of Submission — Its character — Constitution of the Convocation — Power of the Archbishop — Royal and provincial writs — Premunitory clause — Powers of Convocation.

We now enter upon a new period in the history of the convocation, and one of more than usual interest. The Reformation was now in its commencement, and results the most important were the consequence.

The convocation of Canterbury met by continuation in 1532. At this time the commons were become jealous of the privileges of the clergy, of whom they complain in an address to the king. Their complaints were submitted to convocation, by whom an answer was prepared to the allegations. It was agreed to refer the matters in dispute to his majesty, who embraced the opportunity of forcing the clergy into that submission which was yielded during the present year.[a]

To the members of the Anglican Church the subject is one of great interest; for though we might wish to see the Church restored to somewhat of the power which she possessed previous to the Act of Submission, yet it must not be forgotten that this act led the way to the renunciation of the pope's authority in England.[b]

The Act of Submission was brought about by a concurrence of circumstances. Henry was animated by a strong feeling of resentment towards the pope, in consequence of his refusal to sanction the *divorce;* so that a

[a] Wilkins, iii. 748; Wake's State, &c. 476.

[b] Carte, vol. iii. 113, 114.

rupture with Rome, a step which, a few years before, the king could not have contemplated, was a very probable event. In the reign of Edward III. several laws were enacted against the papal encroachments and usurpations; and at a later period the *Act of Præmunire*, by which all papal bulls were prohibited without permission, was passed into a law. The penalties were forfeiture of goods and perpetual banishment. Still the pope persevered in his encroachments, in which he was usually supported by the clergy: and our kings, as has been seen, were either too weak or else disinclined to offer any resistance. Henry VIII. was a man of a different stamp from many of his predecessors. Just at this time, too, the House of Commons took advantage of the king's well-known feelings to complain of the burdensome character of some of the constitutions enacted in various convocations. His majesty determined to exercise his authority: and the clergy necessarily became alarmed, and submitted. In 1532 an act was passed forbidding applications to the court of Rome.[c] The clergy had brought themselves under the *præmunire* by acknowledging the legantine authority of Wolsey. An *indictment* was even preferred against them in the King's Bench; and though his majesty had himself admitted the legantine power, yet he was determined to proceed against the clergy, and awe them into submission. They were told that the king would pardon them on condition of a reasonable composition, and the recognition of his supremacy. This, as was shewn in the last chapter, was yielded. Still the king was dissatisfied. When the convocation submitted their answer to the complaints of the Commons, his majesty proceeded to effect his object. In their answer they claimed the power of making canons. Henry began with them at this point. A Form of Submission was prescribed by the sovereign, to which they were required to subscribe. The king also complained of the difference between their oath to the pope and that to himself.

[c] Collier, ii. 47; Gibson's Codex, 96-98.

In the *first* place, they were required to consent that no constitution or ordinance should be enacted or enforced by the clergy, but with the king's consent; *secondly*, that the existing provincial constitutions,—some of which were deemed prejudicial to the royal prerogative,—should be revised and reviewed by certain persons appointed by his majesty; and *thirdly*, that all other constitutions, agreeable to the laws of God and the land, should continue in force. These articles contain the germ of the Act of Submission. The clergy were in great perplexity. They returned an answer which, though partly a compliance, did not satisfy his majesty. He therefore sent a fresh demand, in a more stringent form, that they should not attempt or claim or put in force any canons, nor enact any new laws, without permission from the crown. The convocation defended their just rights with considerable spirit: but, with the king and the commons against them, how could they maintain their position?

The bishops demurred, and six peers were sent from the king to confer with the Upper House, who, after a conference, replied, that they could not consent not to execute the old canons without the royal permission. Meanwhile the Lower House passed the form in the shape in which it had been forwarded to them by his majesty; and it was brought up to the bishops. The clergy were informed of a conference with the six peers, and that a message had been sent to the king. Under these circumstances, the Lower House were requested to await the return of the peers. At noon they came back with the king's consent to the proposals of the bishops, namely, to bind themselves only not to *enact, promulge, or put in ure* new canons without the royal license. A new draft of the submission was now engrossed, and subscribed by the bishops; but the Lower House, as they had assented to the previous and more stringent form, did not affix their signatures. Thus the form submitted to the king ran only in the name of the Upper House. By such means was this important

matter effected.[d] The Upper House opposed a more decided resistance to the king's demands than the Lower; but continued opposition was impossible.

The submission of the clergy was couched in the following terms: "We do offer and promise, *in verbo sacerdotii*, here unto your highness, submitting ourselves most humbly to the same, that we will never from henceforth *enact, put in force, promulge*, or *execute* any new canons, or constitution provincial, or any new ordinance provincial, or synodal, in our convocation or synod, in time coming (which convocation is, always hath been, and must be assembled only by your high commandment or writ), unless your highness, by your royal assent, shall license us to assemble our convocation, and to *make, promulge*, and *execute* such constitutions and ordinances as shall be made in the same, and thereto give your royal assent and authority."[e]

The king had now gained his object, and the clergy were at his mercy; yet he waited two years before the submission was confirmed and enforced by act of parliament. It appears that the convocation of York did not meet in the year 1532. A new archbishop was appointed in 1531, and a writ was issued for a convocation. As the Archbishop of York was present in the convocation of Canter-

[d] Atterbury, 84-90, 521-528, 530-537, 539-48; Wilkins, iii. 739-746, 748, 749, 754, 755; Wake's State, &c., 476, 477, 545, 546; Collier, ii. 62, 70; App. xix. xx.; Strype's Mem. I. i. 198-209; Fiddes, 524. The archbishop had the writ for their prorogation; one day only remained, when they yielded. The answer to the Commons was drawn up by Gardiner. In the various debates which took place in convocation, they asked for power to enact canons, with the king's consent for publication. It is uncertain whether this proposal came formally before the king; but he had some knowledge of it. After this they agreed to the king's demands not to enact new canons. Wake's State, 542, 545; Atterbury, 87, 89. "Though the clergy removed first to the chapel of St. Catherine's, and after unto that of St. Dunstan, yet found they no saint able to inspire them with a resolution contrary to the king's desires; and therefore upon the Wednesday following they make their absolute submission." Heylin; Fuller's Appeal, part ii. 65.

[e] Fuller, v. (189), (191); Wake's State, 547; Heylin's Tracts, 6.

bury in 1531, it is probable that a correspondence was held between the two provinces on the subject of the submission.[f] However, the business was not settled in York until the next year. In 1533, when the convocation was assembled at York, Henry condescended to write to them on the subject of his title. They now yielded on the same terms as the province of Canterbury.[g]

The convocation met in 1533 by continuation. In 1532 Warham died; and to remove all doubt respecting the convocation, the king commissioned the prior and chapter to proceed with it during the vacancy of the see. It was assembled at the period of Cranmer's consecration; and the archbishop presided immediately after. The question of the divorce was the chief topic for discussion: yet they found time for the consideration of heresy. Latimer was again before them for certain doctrines preached at Bristol. At this time also the answers of the Universities to the questions relative to the marriage were presented; and they addressed the king for an act to abolish the payment of annates to Rome.[h]

The *form*, as we have seen, had been dictated by his majesty; and the act recites the submission of the clergy, and then enacts that they shall not be able to proceed with any convocational business without the permission of the sovereign. It binds the clergy to the performance of the promise contained in their submission.

"Be it, therefore, now enacted by authority of this present parliament, according to the said submission and petition of the said clergy, That they nor any of them from henceforth shall presume to attempt, allege, claim, or put

[f] Wake's State, 398, 477, 478; Collier, ii. 63.

[g] Wilkins, iii. 762-768.

[h] Wilkins, iii. 756, 757, 760, 761; Wake's State, 397, 398; Atterbury, 537, 538; Heylin's Eccles. Res. ii. 7. The question of the divorce was also before the convocation of York this year. Wilkins, iii. 765-768. The marriage was condemned in the Lower House by 253 against 19. Harmer's Specimen, 193-196; Fiddes's Wolsey, 450; Collier, ii. 60; Todd's Introduction, 49; Foxe, 1051; Burnet, I. i. b. 1, III. i. b. 2.

in ure any constitutions, or ordinances provincial, or synodals, or any other canons; nor shall enact, promulge, or execute any such canons, constitutions, or ordinance provincial, by whatever name or names they may be called, in their convocations in time coming, which always shall be assembled by authority of the king's writ, unless the same clergy may have the king's most royal assent and license to make, promulge, and execute such canons, constitutions, and ordinances provincial or synodal, upon pain of every one of the said clergy doing contrary to this act, and being thereof convict, to suffer imprisonment and make fine at the king's will."[i]

It was also enacted that, on the petition of the clergy, thirty-two persons should be appointed by the king to revise the canons and ordinances, and publish them, after the royal assent had been obtained, for the government of the Church. Such a review, however, was never accomplished. By the same act, it was provided that all canons and constitutions which were not repugnant to the laws and customs of the realm, nor injurious to the royal prerogative, should continue in force until the said review should be effected. On the authority of this clause of the Act of Submission the canons of the Anglican Church obtain their force.

Four points, therefore, are settled by the Act of Submission:

First, that the convocation can only be assembled by the king's writ.

Secondly, that when assembled, it cannot proceed to make new canons without a royal license, which is quite a separate act from the permission to assemble.

Thirdly, that having agreed upon canons, in conformity with the royal license, they cannot be published or take effect until confirmed by the sovereign.

[i] Gibson's Codex, 931, 933, 946; Wake's State, 548-551; Wilkins, iii. 770, 771; Collier, ii. 84, 85; Lord Herbert, 178; Heylin's Tracts, 6, 7; Atterbury, 95, 96, 99.

Fourthly, that even with the royal authority, no canon can be enacted against the laws and customs of the land, or the king's prerogative.

Prior to this period the archbishop of each province could assemble his provincial synod at his pleasure, though at the same time the sovereign could summon both provinces by a royal writ. When, too, the convocation met at the command of the king, the archbishop could either dissolve them when the business of the crown was finished, or continue the synod for other purposes by his own authority. The metropolitans could assemble the clergy at pleasure. They had a right independent of the crown. Even when assembled for state purposes by the king's writ, the metropolitans could proceed to the consideration of matters ecclesiastical. It is evident, that prior to the Act of Submission there were two kinds of ecclesiastical councils—the one a synod for the affairs of the Church, called by the archbishops; the other a state convocation, summoned by royal writ. Such was the state of things prior to 1533; but since that period the convocation cannot assemble, even for church purposes, without the royal permission, nor, when assembled, proceed to business without a special license from the sovereign. When met for the purpose of granting subsidies only, they were a state convocation; but when they were permitted to proceed to other business, they became a council, or provincial synod, in the strict and proper sense;[j] so that, since the act in question, the convocation has been entirely dependent on the sovereigns, who have summoned it according to their necessities, or when the circumstances of the Church rendered it expedient.

Thus, in the year 1534 the submission of the clergy was confirmed by Act of Parliament. Henry proceeded cautiously, yet resolutely. In the first place he compelled the clergy to acknowledge his supremacy; afterwards, in 1532, they were constrained to subscribe a form of sub-

[j] Wake's State, 439; Heylin's Tracts, fol. p. 2

mission, by which they were prohibited from making canons by virtue of their own power; and now the aid of an Act of Parliament was called in to confirm the proceedings.

It was by virtue of the supremacy, that the royal injunctions, subsequent to the Act of Submission, were issued; and it is on the same ground that the dean and chapter of a cathedral are compelled to choose for their bishop the individual nominated by the crown.[k]

Since the submission, the convocation is restrained from enacting canons; but it can confer on many other things without a license from the crown. They may petition the crown for a license to transact business; and they can present their grievances. Opinions differ with respect to their power to treat of making canons. By some persons it is asserted that they can discuss the subject, and even make a draft of canons, though they cannot enact any thing: but by others it is supposed that they are even restricted from treating of or discussing such matters without the royal license. By the former it is supposed, that the convocation only needs the license to finish or to give authority to the canons which may be enacted; by the latter it is contended, that the license is necessary before the question of canons can be entertained.

It may be remarked, that Christian kings always had more authority than was granted them by the Church of Rome. At this time, therefore, a power was restored to the crown, which had been wrested from it by the papal see. Some of the more moderate of the Romish bishops admitted the authority of the prince over convocations. It was admitted by Tunstal and Stokesley, in a letter to

[k] Wake's State, 535, 538, 539, 606. "There are three different steps or periods to be observed: the first, when the king's supreme headship was acknowledged in February 1530, 1531; the second, when the clergy, in May 1532, yielded up their power of making canons by their own sole authority; and the third, when the concession was ratified by parliament." Atterbury, 95, 96.

Cardinal Pole; and even Queen Mary, at the commencement of her reign, acted on the Act of Submission passed in that of her father.[l] From the earliest period the polity of the Church was modelled after that of the empire. Before the empire became Christian, all ecclesiastical affairs were settled by the bishops and clergy in their synods; and subsequent to the time of Constantine, the only change that was made was this, that their proceedings were subject to imperial approbation. Matters remained on the same footing until the rise of the papal usurpation.[m] That usurpation was not cast off, though some of our sovereigns resisted it, until the Reformation. In England, during the Saxon Heptarchy, the power of the Archbishop of Canterbury as metropolitan was recognised, as has been already noticed, in all the kingdoms.

I have traced the various steps by which the papal power was established over the Anglican Church; and the reader will perceive from the foregoing history that art accomplished what could not be effected by force.[n] The pope succeeded in establishing his legantine authority here by inducing the Archbishops of Canterbury to act as his *legates*. For many years the archbishops governed by virtue of their legantine, and not of their metropolitan character; and at length the usurpation was so complete that the pope claimed it, and the people viewed it as a right.[o] Canterbury was generally the tool of the papacy: instead of purely national and provincial synods, there was a series of legantine councils, by means of which the papal usurpation was mainly established.[p] "Thus papal usurpa-

[l] Wake's Appeal, p. 29; Strype's Cranmer.

[m] Reynolds's Historical Essay upon the Government of the Church of England, pp. 4, 5. How far the supremacy extends, it is difficult to decide. By the Act of Submission great powers were certainly vested in the crown. "After which time, whatsoever the king or his successors did in the Reformation, as it had virtually the power of the convocations, so was it as effectual and good in law as if the clergy in their convocation particularly, and *in terminis*, had agreed upon it." Heylin's Tracts, 41.

[n] Reynolds, 30-32. [o] Ibid. 34. [p] Ibid. 44.

tions got footing here under a colour of right and justice, in the semblance of municipal usages and the forms of law; and the national Church lost its independence not by the violence of foreign intrusions, but by the prevalence of domestic corruption, turning the edge of the constitution against the liberties of its own citizens."[q]

From the preceding narrative it will be seen that the convocation is assembled by the royal writ, but that it is not properly an ecclesiastical synod until the license for business is granted. It is merely the license for business that is now wanting to permit the convocation to transact any matters which the crown might recommend, or the circumstances of the Church require.[r]

Having sketched the history of English councils to the period of the Act of Submission, and having detailed the particulars connected with the passing of that measure, since which time the constitution of the convocation has undergone no change, I shall now submit a view of its structure to my readers.

England is divided into the two provinces of Canterbury and York. The convocation of Canterbury consists of all the bishops of the province, who constitute the upper house; and of the deans, archdeacons, proctors of chapters, and proctors for the parochial clergy, who compose the lower house. Before the dissolution of the monasteries the abbots also had seats in the upper house, at which time its members were more numerous than those of the lower. At

[q] Reynolds, 34. The question of the supremacy is discussed in so many works, that the difficulty consists in making a selection. Whitgift's Defence, 698-702; Bancroft's Survey, c. xxii. xxiii.; Jewel's Defence, 582, 592, 597, 600-604; Bilson's True Difference, 134, 153-155, 159, 207, 208, 227, 264, 266, 276; Hooker; Barrow; Bramhall, 494.

[r] Wake's State, p. 4. "Whatsoever the clergy did or might do lawfully before the Act of Submission in their convocations of their own power without the king's authority and consent concurring, the same they can and may do still, the king's authority and consent co-operating." Heylin's Tracts, 18. "Since this year all convocations (so long as they lasted) are born tongue-tied." Fuller, v. (191.)

present, however, the upper house in the province of Canterbury consists of the bishops; the lower, of the dignitaries, who are ex-officio members, and the proctors.

The method of choosing the proctors for the clergy varies somewhat in different places. In the diocese of London each archdeaconry chooses two, and from the whole number so chosen the bishop selects two to attend the convocation. In Sarum the three archdeacons choose six, and the six make a selection of two of their own number; and the same method is adopted in the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry. In Bath and Wells all the incumbents choose their proctors jointly. In Lincoln the clergy of the six archdeaconries send commissioners to Stamford, who make the necessary choice of two persons. In Norwich the two archdeaconries of Norwich and Norfolk meet and choose one, and the archdeaconries of Suffolk and Sudbury choose the other. The same is the case in Chichester. In ancient times the clergy were represented in convocation by the archdeacons. Such is the mode of choosing proctors in the province of Canterbury. In the province of York two proctors are returned by each archdeaconry. Were it not so, the numbers would be too small for the transaction of business.[8]

The archbishop is president of the convocation. A prolocutor is chosen by the clergy, who is presented to the archbishop. On his presentation he intimates that the lower house intend to deliver their resolutions to the upper house through him, whose duty it is also to collect the votes of his brethren and to secure the attendance of the members.

As president, the archbishop summons the convocation to meet at the command of the king. Were he to attempt to assemble a synod of his own authority, he would be subject to a *præmunire*, and the proceedings of such synod would be void. Since the Act of Submission, however, the power to summon the convocation at the commence-

[8] Hody, p. iii. 12, and p. iii. 283, 284.

ment of a new parliament has usually been granted, though for many years no business has been transacted. It is also the duty of the archbishop to prorogue and dissolve the convocation under the direction of the crown.[t]

By the term "convocation" is meant the synod of the province either of Canterbury or York, each archbishop summoning his own clergy in obedience to the royal command. The convocation is the provincial council of Canterbury and York. Each province meets in its own synod; but on important occasions, instances of which will occur in the course of our inquiry, the two provinces can act by mutual consent or correspondence; or commissioners, as has sometimes been the case, may be sent from York to sit in the convocation of Canterbury, with full power to act for the whole body.[u]

Formerly two writs were used in assembling the clergy. First the king's writ, and secondly the provincial. The first was addressed to each bishop, commanding him to appear in parliament, containing what is called the *præmunientes* clause, which was so called from the commencing word.

"Præmunientes priorum et capitulum ecclesiæ vestræ archidiaconum totumque clerum vestræ diœceseos, facientes quod iidem prior et archidiaconus in propriis personis suis dictumque capitulum per unum idemque clerus per duos procuratores idoneos plenam et sufficientem potestatem, ab ipsis capitulo et clero habentes: una vobiscum intersint, modis omnibus tunc ibidem ad tractand., ordinand., et faciend. nobiscum et cum ceteris prelatis proceribus: et aliis incolis regni nostri qualiter hujusmodi periculis et excogitatis malitiis obviandum."

Such is the *præmunitory* clause, by which the clergy were formerly summoned together with the parliament. On receipt of the writ, the bishop sent his mandate to the dean and chapter and also to the archdeacons, commanding the dean to appear personally, and the latter to send re-

[t] Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 38, 39. [u] Ibid. i. 150-152

presentatives to the parliament. This clause, it appears, was inserted in the bishop's writ in the twenty-third year of Edward I. When assembled by this writ the clergy constituted a state convocation, not the provincial synod. When the clause was inserted, there was a danger of invasion from France; and it is clear that the clergy were not assembled by this clause as an ecclesiastical council, but to assist the king in his necessities. This is evident from the words *hujusmodi periculis et excogitatis malitiis obviandum*. The clause was, however, continued in the writ after the cause for its insertion had ceased to exist; but whenever they were summoned by virtue of this writ, they constituted a part of the parliament. The clause, with a slight variation, is still retained in the writ by which the bishops are summoned to parliament.[v]

The *second* was the *provincial writ*. This is as old as the reign of Edward II. This sovereign was prevailed upon by Archbishop Winchelsey to issue another writ to the archbishop, besides the writ to the bishops. When it was first issued, it was intended to secure obedience to the previous summons, and to render the assembly of the clergy more canonical, as meeting by virtue of the archbishop's call. This is the writ by which the convocation is still assembled; for though, previous to the Act of Submission, the archbishop could himself summon the convocation of his province, yet since the act in question he can only call them together by command of the crown.[w]

[v] Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 158; Wake's Authority, 210, 211; Reynolds's Essay, 237. The clause calls upon the deans and archdeacons, and representatives of the cathedral and parochial clergy, to attend the parliaments. By means of this clause Edward I. brought the lower clergy to parliament for the purpose of subsidies. The clergy came reluctantly; and as they wished to consult together on ecclesiastical affairs, they were also permitted to meet in provincial synods. Wake's State, 427; Atterbury, 348; Heylin's Laud, 420; Wake's Authority, 363-366, 368. The convocation, therefore, is a different assembly from that formerly called by the præmunientes clause.

[w] Heylin's Examen, p. 96.

The writ is ordered by the lord chancellor, prepared by the clerk of the crown, and then transmitted to the archbishop, who issues his *mandate* to the Bishop of London as dean of the province of Canterbury. During a vacancy of the see of London, the *mandate* is sent to the Bishop of Winchester as sub-dean.[x]

That the clergy were summoned to parliament on some occasions by virtue of the *præmunitory* clause in the bishop's writ is certain; but probably the instances were rare. Such is the opinion of Hody, who observes, "This rule I shall lay down, that we are not to conclude from any instance that the clergy sat in parliament strictly so called, unless it does appear that they are to be understood of the clergy of both provinces." Again: "Though we find the clergy of England in general mentioned as in parliament, yet neither from thence dare I confidently infer, that whenever such an expression occurs they sat strictly speaking in parliament."[y] Still it is clear that occasionally such was the case, and Hody himself allows it in another passage, in which he observes: "From the reign of Henry VI. the inferior clergy seldom if at all sat in parliament."[z]

But though the inferior clergy did not sit in parliament, yet they became a component part of the provincial synod from a very early period.[a] Originally the bishops and clergy sat together in the same house; and when any sub-

[x] Hody, 13; Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 159.

[y] Hody, part ii. 424, 425. It is said that the clergy were allowed to recede from parliament about the middle of the reign of Edward III., when their appearance in convocation at the king's call was accepted as an equivalent. The præmunientes clause, indeed, was rarely executed, and never after the time of Henry VIII. Kennet's Letter, 110-112; Wake's Authority, 223. They chose a prolocutor as early as the reign of Edward III.; so that they must have acted in convocation. Wake's Authority, 219, 220. In the reign of Henry VIII. the House of Lords did not sit on convocation days. Ib. 221.

[z] Hody, part ii. 426.

[a] At first the bishops only were summoned; but by degrees the clergy formed a necessary part of the convocation. Wake's State, 107-119.

ject arose in the debate in which they were especially concerned, they were accustomed to retire into a separate room. The result of their debate was afterwards communicated to the bishops. But the clergy of the province of Canterbury had a distinct place for their business as early as the beginning of the fifteenth century; and a prolocutor was chosen to preside over their deliberations. In the province of York the bishops and clergy still sit together in the same house.[b] The separation into two houses in the province of Canterbury was brought about gradually.[c] The place was assigned by the archbishop as president of the whole convocation, and at first was not always the same, though afterwards, for convenience, they met in one room.[d]

Thus with every parliament the archbishops summon their convocations, on the authority of the provincial writ, the one to meet in London, the other at York. Members of the lower house, who are absent by leave, may vote by proxy; and bishops, who hold deaneries *in commendam*, may nominate persons to represent those dignities in the lower house.

The prolocutor of the lower house was at first merely chosen for a particular occasion, such as their retirement from the bishops for some special business; but when they became a separate house, it was necessary that the prolocutor should hold his office during the convocation. The president, with his suffragan bishops, has authority to enjoin the clergy to consider such matters as he may submit to their notice. He can also appoint committees of the lower house for special business. This right was, indeed, denied in 1689; but it is clear that it had always been exercised by the archbishop. It would be strange indeed if the archbishop and bishops could not command the advice of their presbyters; or if the latter should exercise a power independently of their superiors, to whom they owe canonical obedience. The controversy on the

[b] Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 161.

[c] Synodus Anglicana, 79, 80.

[d] Ibid. 83, 84.

subject will be noticed in its proper place; but it was necessary to allude to it here in stating the powers respectively possessed by the two houses.[e] The archbishop's power of proroguing or continuing the convocation was also denied in the controversy between the two houses in the reigns of King William and Queen Anne.[f]

The powers of convocation are great. They have power to correct and depose offenders; to examine and censure heretical works; and, having obtained the royal license, they can make and publish canons, alter the liturgy, and in short transact all business of an ecclesiastical character.[g] Every day's meeting of convocation is called a session; whereas all the meetings of parliament, from the period of their assemblage to their prorogation, are but one session.[h] By statute the clergy are protected from arrest, just as the members of the parliament, during their attendance on convocation. Only rectors, vicars, and perpetual curates can vote for proctors to represent the clergy in the lower house. On their first meeting, the archbishop consults with his suffragans respecting a convenient day for proceeding to business; a *schedule* is then prepared, in which the day is fixed, which, as it continues the convocation from one day to another, is called a schedule of continuation. The *schedule* is signed by his grace, and attested by a public notary; it is then communicated to the lower house, who are included in the *schedule,* though this point was violently contested at a later period. The convocation has not acted as a provincial synod for many years, because the royal license has not been granted. As soon as the license is issued, a power is given to the convocation which it did not pre-

[e] Synodus Anglicana, 107, 116, 118. [f] Ibid. 183, 225-231, 252.

[g] With respect to the liturgy, the sanction of parliament would be necessary, in consequence of the Act of Uniformity, to authorise any change. Happily there is no danger of such a rash proceeding on the part of either convocation or parliament.

[h] Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 154, 155.

viously possess, though assembled by royal writ. It is then a provincial synod, and competent to transact ecclesiastical business. "They are a convocation by his writ of summons; but a council, properly speaking, they are not, nor can they legally act as such till they have obtained the king's license so to do."[i]

One privilege possessed by the Lower House must not be forgotten. They can exercise a negative on the proceedings of the Upper House. "The greatest power enjoyed by the English clergy in a provincial synod, beyond the presbyters of other nations, is a negative upon the metropolitan and bishops, none of whose resolutions, either in part or in whole, can be passed into synodical acts without the previous approbation of the inferior clergy."[k] This is a very important privilege. By virtue of their negative voice the clergy would always be able to thwart the proceedings of the bishops; for were they to refuse their assent, no measure could be carried.

The convocation, therefore, though it cannot enact canons without the authority of the crown, can refuse its assent to measures proposed by the sovereign. By the Act of Submission, they cannot meet without the royal writ; nor, when assembled, make canons without the royal license; nor publish them, when framed, without the royal confirmation under the great seal. Before the submission, the sovereign required the archbishops to assemble the convocations whenever a subsidy was required; and the metropolitans could also convene them by their own authority for Church purposes. Moreover, when assembled by the royal writ on the king's business, the archbishop could permit them to enter upon ecclesiastical matters, and thus use them both for the sovereign and the Church. Though they are now under considerable restraints, yet they can state their grievances. In the controversy of the last century, it was argued that the convocations had a right to be assembled with every par-

[i] Wake's State, 4. [k] Synodus Anglicana, 172; Johnson, i. 153.

liament, and the custom has certainly prevailed for a long period; yet it may be questioned whether the power of calling them or not, is not in the crown. By the Act of Submission the royal power is enlarged, while that of the archbishops is abridged, since they cannot assemble their synods without the royal writ.[1]

[1] Wake's State, 425, 439, 440, 606; Atterbury, 2, 78 (131), (132), (133), (139), (140), 121, 124. All turns on the interpretation of the Act of Submission. Fuller remarks, that the word 'convocation' is derived from "*convocari faciatis*, being formerly called synods, as lately (since our Scotizing) termed assemblies," v. (191.)

CHAPTER VI.

A.D. 1534-1558.

Discussions in Convocation — Bidding Prayer — Cromwell — Propositions submitted to Convocation — Book of Articles — Feasts abolished — Feast of Dedication of Churches — Institution of a Christian Man — Six Articles — Bible — Primers — Edward VI. — Order of Matrimony — Order of Communion — Liturgy — Ordination Service — Second Liturgy — Articles, 1552 — Catechism — Homilies — Mary — Convocation at London; at Oxford; at London — Pole's Legantine Synod — Mary's death.

In the convocation assembled in 1534 it was debated whether the pope had greater jurisdiction than other foreign bishops. In both provinces it was declared that, by the Word of God, he could not exercise greater authority in this country than any other foreign prelate.[a] Soon after, Cranmer altered the terms in which the style and title of the archbishop were usually expressed, removing the words *Apostolicæ sedis legatus*, and inserting *Metropolitanus*. At this time therefore it was generally declared by the clergy, that the power exercised by the pope in England was a usurpation over the Church.

The convocation also agreed to address the king on the subject of a translation of the Bible. Tyndal's Testament had been published some few years, and it was complained of by some of the clergy as inaccurate. It does not appear, however, that any thing was done beyond the expression of the opinion of the convocation. In the same assembly it was determined that the laity should not dispute on the subject of religion.[b] Relying on the Acts of Parliament, by which the supremacy was asserted to be in the king, his majesty issued an order respecting preaching and

[a] Wake's State, 478, 479, 490; Collier, ii. 94; Strype's Cranmer, i. 36; Wilkins, iii. 782.

[b] Collier, ii. 95.

bidding of prayers. The clergy were also commanded to strike the pope's name from the offices of the Church, and to declare against his *supremacy*. It was ordered, that whoever preached before the king should, at the *bidding of the beads*, pray for the Catholic Church both *quick* and *dead*. "And first, as we are most bounden, for our sovereign lord King Henry the Eighth, being immediately next unto God the only and supreme head of this our Catholic Church of England, and for the most gracious lady Queen Anne his wife, and for the Lady Elizabeth, daughter and heir to them both, the princess, and no further." It was also ordered that the collects for the king and queen should be used at high mass throughout the kingdom.[c]

In the year 1535 Cromwell was constituted Vicar General by royal commission, and certain injunctions were issued by virtue of the supremacy. The convocation assembled; but no other business than the grant of the subsidy appears to have been transacted. The parliament was dissolved in 1535; consequently a new convocation, and the first after the Act of Submission, assembled in 1536.[d]

The year 1536 was marked by the fall of the queen, Anne Boleyn, into the particulars of whose tragical history we need not enter in this work. His majesty, not content with taking her life, procured a sentence of divorce, which was confirmed by convocation. The sentence was brought to the convocation by Cromwell, and signed by both houses. In this convocation Cromwell took his seat as vice-gerent, sitting above the archbishop; and on one occasion he sent a deputy, to whom the same precedence was granted.[e]

The sermon at the opening of the convocation in 1536

[c] Collier, ii. 100, 101; Wilkins, iii. 783. The convocation this year petitioned the king relative to suspected books. Henry in consequence issued a proclamation for bringing in all suspicious publications. Another proclamation was issued on the subject of heresy. Ib. 776-779.

[d] Wilkins, iii. 784, 785, 799-802.

[e] Collier, ii. 117-119; Fuller, v. 207, 208; Mackintosh, ii. 201; Wilkins, iii. 803; Lingard, vi. 395-397; Atterbury, 365, 366; Tenison, Mss. vol. 751, p 109-114.

was preached by Latimer. The prolocutor of the lower house submitted to the upper a book of erroneous opinions, with a remonstrance against some of the propositions contained in the volume. In this remonstrance the supremacy is fully recognised; and the authority previously exercised by the pope is declared to have been a usurpation. The propositions condemned are *fifty-nine* in number. They shew the progress of the Reformation; while the protest of the clergy may be regarded as a proof that they still clung to the errors of Rome, though they had renounced the supremacy of the pope. Among other things in these propositions, the *sacrament of the altar* was condemned; *extreme unction* denied to be a sacrament; *communion in both kinds* asserted to be a scriptural doctrine; *reverence to saints and to the Virgin* censured as idolatrous; and *purgatory, and several other doctrines,* were denied. The lower house complain that the circulation of such books should be permitted. Fuller calls the *fifty-nine* propositions the Protestant religion in ore; while Collier asserts that many of them were erroneous. It is, indeed, certain that many of them were quite as erroneous as the views which were condemned.[f] A similar course was pursued in the other province.

Certain articles of religion were set forth in this same year by convocation. They were first proposed by the king, debated in convocation and carried, and then signed by the majority of the two houses. Two lists of subscriptions are given by Collier, in one of which are the signatures of both the archbishops, so that both provinces must have acted in concert. Probably nothing more was done by the bishops and clergy than to hear them read, and give their assent.[g]

[f] Collier, ii. 120, 121; Fuller, v. 208, 209, 212; Strype's Mem. I. i. 378-382, App. lxxiv.; Wilkins, iii. 804-807, 812.

[g] There are two copies in *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.*, edited by the late Bishop of Oxford, one printed from Berthelet's edition, the other from the Cotton MS. The titles vary considerably, though

The progress of the Reformation at this time may be traced by these articles. Several abuses are rectified, though some Romish errors are retained. The clergy are required to teach all things contained in the Scriptures and the three creeds, and to condemn all things contrary thereto, as they had been condemned in the *first four general councils*. Baptism is enjoined as necessary to salvation; four sacraments were altogether omitted; purgatory was left doubtful; penance is retained as a sacrament; transubstantiation is asserted; justification is defined to be remission of sins and reconciliation with God; images are to be retained, but kneeling to them, and other acts of adoration, are forbidden; saints are to be honoured; and the doctrine of purgatory is recognised, with certain explanations. Though, therefore, much error was retained, yet these articles were calculated to advance the Reformation, for they embody many sentiments at variance with the received doctrines of the Romish Church. That Cranmer was concerned in the preparation of these articles there is good reason to believe.[h]

in both it is stated that they were sanctioned by convocation. The title of the printed copy is as follows: "Articles devised by the Kinges Majestie, to stablyshe Christen Quietnes and Unitie amonge us, and to avoyde contentious Opinions, which Articles be also approved by the consent and determination of the hole Clergie of this Realme. Anno M.D.XXXVI." Wake's State, 491, 587, 588; Wake's Authority, 113; Collier, ii. 122-128; Fuller, v. 213-222; Formularies of Faith; Wilkins, iii. 817-826; Foxe, 1093, 1094; Strype's Cranmer, 57-63; ib. Mem. I. i. 466; Heylin's Tracts, 10; Lord Herbert, 202; Carte, 137, 138. Atterbury thinks that these articles were agreed upon in convocation without a license; and it seems that no formal one was issued, though it is certain that the royal permission was granted by a message through the archbishop. Wake's State, 589. Fuller gives a copy of the articles, which he transcribed from the convocation acts now destroyed, v. 213-223.

[h] Strype's Cranmer, i. 57, 63; Carte, iii. 137, 138. "The clergy did the work as to them seemed best, never advising with the parliament but upon the *post fact*, and in most cases not at all. There was but little done in King Henry's time, but that which was acted by the clergy only in their convocation, and so commended to the people by the king's sole authority." Heylin's Tracts, 10.

The pope was now about to hold a council at Mantua; and as it was probable that the proceedings in England would be censured, it was deemed desirable that the convocation should deliver an opinion on the subject. They stated, therefore, that neither the Bishop of Rome nor any one prince, without the consent of others, could assemble a general council; and a *remonstrance* to that effect was signed by the convocation.[i] Certain injunctions were also set forth by the king's authority respecting holydays, and with the consent of the convocation. It was declared that the *festivals* were so numerous, that it was scarcely possible to gather in the harvest in consequence of the cessation from labour; and that so many days of relaxation produced a habit of idleness and led to intemperance. Numbers were accordingly abolished; and among others, was the *feast* of the patron saint of every church, called the *church holyday;* but the *feast* of the Dedication of All Churches was ordered to be kept only on the first Sunday in October. Feasts falling in the time of harvest were to be open to labour, except those of the Apostles, the Virgin, and those festivals on which the judges did not sit at Westminster.[j]

Cromwell introduced Alesius, a Scotchman, into the convocation on one occasion, either this year or the next, who delivered an address on the sacraments, contending that the Eucharist and Baptism alone were of Divine institution. Collier and Burnet assert that the circumstance occurred in 1536, but Atterbury contends that it was in 1537.[k]

An important book, the *Institution of a Christian Man*, was put forth in 1537.[l] The preface, which was addressed

[i] Wilkins, iii. 808, 809; Collier, ii. 128; Heylin's Tracts, 10. Bonner's signature is appended.

[j] Collier, ii. 129; Burnet, i. part 1.

[k] Collier, ii. 124; Atterbury, 367; Ant. Brit. 331.

[l] The Institution of a Christian Man, containing the Exposition or Interpretation of the common Creed, of the Seven Sacraments, of the Ten

to the king, was subscribed by the bishops, archdeacons, and others. It was called the Bishops' Book, because drawn up principally by their authority.[m] It comprehends the greater portion of the *Book of Articles;* and notwithstanding the erroneous views which it contained, there was still much that was true, and its tendency was to further the cause of the Reformation.[n]

Cromwell presided in the convocation this year, opening the assembly with a speech, in which he tells the members that they were summoned to determine certain controversies in religion.[o]

A new convocation was summoned to meet in May 1539 at St. Paul's, when it was prorogued until the ensuing November. The convocation of York was also assembled at the same time. It was in this convocation that the *Six Articles,* so memorable in the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII., were framed by those who were adverse to the Reformation, and who took advantage of the king's feelings at this time to procure the enactment of those severe decrees.[p] They were approved by the convocation, and subsequently sanctioned by the parliament. The *first* asserted the popish view of transubstantiation; the *second* defended half-communion; the *third* enforced clerical celibacy; the *fourth* related to vows of chastity; the *fifth* sanctioned private masses; and the *sixth*

Commandments, and of the Paternoster, Ave Maria, Justification, and Purgatory, 1537, 4to.

[m] It appears that the king first issued a commission; and when the book was arranged, it was submitted first to his majesty, then to the convocation, by whom it was authorised. This is intimated in the preface, in which the Act of Submission is alluded to. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue are expounded; the Seven Sacraments are explained. Heylin's Eccles. Res. 9; ib. Tracts, 549. Collier is mistaken in supposing that it was drawn up in convocation three years before. Collier, ii. 139.

[n] Collier, ii. 139-143; Strype's Cranmer, i. 72-78, 110; ib. Mem. I. i. 486, 487; Wilkins' Concilia, iii. 831; Laurence's Bampton Lectures, 190, 200; Wake's State, 590.

[o] Atterbury, 367; Wake's State, 584.

[p] Wilkins' Concilia, iii. 845; Wake's State, 590.

insisted on auricular confession. They were opposed in parliament, with great force, by Cranmer; but the opposition was vain, and they became a law.[q]

In the convocation of 1539, Cromwell, who presided as vice-gerent, proposed certain questions on the eucharist, the marriage of the clergy, confession, private masses, and communion in both kinds. The convocation decided that transubstantiation was a true doctrine, that communion in both kinds was not necessary, that the marriage of the clergy was unlawful, and that private masses should be retained. The convocation was prorogued to November, then to January, and then continued to April 1540, when, after a subsidy, they were united with the convocation of York, by command of the king, in a national synod, to consider the business of Anne of Cleves, from whom his majesty was resolved to be divorced. A committee was appointed to examine the subject; and, after hearing evidence, the convocation decided that the marriage should be set aside. It was afterwards annulled also by act of parliament.[r]

It was proposed in convocation, in 1541, that the translations of the Bible should be reviewed. Gardiner read a list of Latin words, which he contended should not be translated, or that they should be altered as slightly as possible. His object was to keep the people in ignorance, and to foster the notions which they had imbibed before the Bible was translated. That such was his aim is clear from the following selection from the list of words proposed to be retained: "Pœnitentia, pontifex, simulacrum, mysterium, sacrificium." Cranmer at length informed the house, that the Book was to be reviewed by the universities, upon which some of the prelates expressed

[q] Collier, ii. 168; Strype's Memorials, I. i. 542; Wake's State, 590.

[r] Collier, ii. 179; Wilkins, iii. 845, 846, 850-855; Strype's Memorials, I. i. 556-560; Atterbury, 400; Wake's State, 492; Collier, ii. 178.

their dissatisfaction, alleging that the learning of the nation was rather to be found in the convocation.[s]

In the same convocation Cranmer moved that candles and ornaments should be removed from images, that missals and liturgical works might be reformed, and that the name of the pope and of Becket should be erased. The examination of the books was entrusted to a committee of bishops, who were to join with them certain members of the lower house. The clergy, however, declined to act, so that the business was left to the bishops. Whether the motion was carried into effect is uncertain.[t] The archbishop also submitted a proposal to the synod respecting the arrangement of homilies; but it is not possible to ascertain what progress was actually made in the work.[u]

Notwithstanding the check which the Six Articles imposed upon the Reformation, some advances continued to be made. The upper house of convocation, for instance, ordered that the curate of the parish should, on every Sunday and holyday in the year, read to the people, after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat*, one chapter of the New Testament in English, without exposition; and after the New Testament was finished, it was ordered that the Old Testament should be taken up in the same order. This was an important step. The Bible had been set up in churches some time; but now it was regularly read to the people.[v]

[s] Collier, ii. 185; Strype's Cranmer, i. 134, 135; Wake's State, 426; Wilkins, iii. 860-862. It was debated whether there should be a new version; and it was argued that the Bible then in use could not be retained unless it were submitted to an examination. Nothing was effected, and the existing versions continued to be used. Lewis's History of Translations, 145; Fuller, v. 237-239. The York convocation met this year. Wilkins, iii. 862, Wake's State, 492.

[t] Collier, ii. 185.

[u] Tenison Mss. 751; Strype's Memorials, I. i. 573. The Homilies were, however, composed by some of the bishops, and submitted to the house. Wake's State, 591; Wilkins, iii. 862, 863.

[v] Collier, ii. 186; Wilkins, iii. 864-867; Strype's Cranmer, 139, 140.

The convocation was continued from time to time without doing much business. In 1543, a revision of the *Institution*, or Bishops' Book, was set forth by royal authority, under the title, *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, set forth by the King's Majesty of England.* There are certain additions, yet still it may be regarded as the *Institution* in a new form. The additions, however, were a retrograde movement; and instead of advancing in the work of reformation, there was in the new work a greater approximation to the errors of popery. It bends to the Six Articles; transubstantiation was asserted. This movement was probably brought about by the influence of Gardiner. Collier calls it a *review and alteration* of the *Institution;* and remarks that it was *supplemental in some articles.* The preface was composed by his majesty, and the book was called the King's Book. "Where the *Erudition* differs from the *Institution,* it seems mostly to lose ground, to go off from the primitive plan, and reform backwards." The *Institution* was submitted to the convocation, and confirmed by its authority. First the various parts were discussed in the lower house, and then it was sanctioned by both, though it was published in his majesty's name.[w] It is observable that both these works assert bishops and priests to be the same order, the former being superior only in degree. The convocation was continued to 1544, when, after meeting a few times, it was dissolved.[x]

King Henry's last parliament was convened A.D. 1544. With the parliament the convocation was assembled in both provinces. In this convocation the Litany, in English, nearly in its present form, was duly authorised for general use. The title expressly asserts, that it was "thought meet by the king's majesty and his clergy to

[w] Collier, ii. 188-191; Wilkins, iii. 868; Strype's Mem. I. i. 583-585. Collier is utterly mistaken in supposing that the "necessary doctrine was not sanctioned by convocation." Heylin's Tracts, 549.

[x] Wilkins, iii. 868, 869.

be read by the people in every church." It is therefore evident that it was sanctioned by convocation.[y] Several meetings and prorogations are recorded; but it does not appear that much business, besides granting subsidies, was transacted.[z] The death of his majesty dissolved the convocation A.D. 1547.

A few particulars respecting the Primers of this reign may be given, since they mark the progress made in the Reformation under Henry. Various editions of the Sarum Primer, in English, existed; but the first of the reformed books was published in 1534. It retained but few holydays, a general confession followed the calendar, and the preface was very obnoxious to the Romanists. It was reprinted in 1535; and from a passage in Sir Thomas More's Answer to Tyndal, it is supposed that Joye was the translator of the portions which had been derived from the old books. Objections having been raised against the former edition, the translator mentions, in his preface to the second, that the omission of the Litany arose from no feeling of opposition to the saints. The Litany then in use was full of addresses to the Virgin and saints. No copy of an earlier edition than 1534 is known; but the book existed in type or in MS. in 1530, since in that year the omission of the Litany in a new Primer is made the subject of a complaint in convocation. More's preface was written in 1532; and at that time the book must have been generally known. The edition in the Bodleian, supposed to be of the year 1534, has no date; but that the year is correctly assigned is evident from the calendar, which commences with that date, and more especially from the fact, that Sir Thomas More mentions a new saint, "Sir Thomas Hilton," whose

[y] It was printed by Grafton 1544, also by Berthelet the same year. It is reprinted by the Parker Society. Atterbury, 193.

[z] The synod of York met during the vacancy of the see, under the authority of a writ directed to the guardian of the spiritualities. It merely granted subsidies. Both convocations were continued from time to time till the death of the king. Wilkins, iii. 869, 871, 877; ib. iv. 3.

name was inserted in the early edition. No such name occurs in the Bodleian copy. In 1534 a Primer was objected to in convocation, even by Cranmer. This must have been the edition published by Marshall in that year. Cranmer could not have been concerned in its publication, as Strype imagined, since he advised a proclamation against its circulation.[a] In 1539 another Primer was published by Bishop Hilsey, who succeeded Fisher in the see of Rochester. Though Cranmer was opposed to Marshall's, yet he gave his sanction to this book. It is less hostile to popery than Marshall's; but at that time Cranmer retained several of the errors of Rome. It was submitted to his inspection before publication, though not soon enough to receive his corrections. The errors, it seems, were not of such importance as to render it necessary to stop the publication. It is altogether a different book from the preceding, though it has sometimes been called an edition of the same work. Marshall's was objected to even by those who were favourable to a reformation.[b]

The next Primer was that of 1545, called the King's Primer, because published by his authority. This again differs from the two preceding. It contains the Litany of 1544, which was afterwards, with a few alterations, incor-

[a] A goodly Prymer in English, newly corrected and printed, with certain godly Meditations and Prayers, &c. Imprinted at London, &c. by John Byddell, &c. for William Marshall: 1535. It was usually called Marshall's Primer, because he was the publisher. That no earlier edition than 1534 is known will not surprise those who recollect the orders against such books at various times. Books of a later date have been known to exist, and yet copies cannot now be found. Occasionally books are now discovered, the existence of which was not known. I have a Primer, of the reign of Elizabeth, which differs from all other editions. In fact, its existence was not known until this copy was discovered. Marshall's Primer was reprinted in 1537. Dibdin's Typ. Ant. iii. 388, 389, 392; Strype's Cranmer, 325; Collier, 111, 112; Wilkins, iii. 733, 769.

[b] The Manual of Prayers, or the Primer in English, set out at length, &c. Set forth by John, late Bishop of Rochester, &c. Imprinted, &c. &c. 1539. It was printed several times. Hilsey died this year. Wood's Athenæ, i. 112; Dibdin's Typ. Ant. iii. 518; State Papers of Henry VIII. i. 559.

porated with the *Book of Common Prayer*. Great mistakes are made about these books. Frequently they are taken for various editions of the same book; whereas they are totally different from, and independent of, each other.[c]

Edward VI. succeeded to the throne on his father's death. "No sooner was he come to the crown but a peaceable dew refreshed God's inheritance in England, formerly parched with persecution; and this good angel struck off the fetters from many Peters in prison, *preserving those who were appointed to die*."[d]

In the first year of his reign the convocation of both provinces assembled as usual with the parliament. The Dean of Lincoln was chosen prolocutor of the lower house, in the province of Canterbury, and presented to the archbishop and bishops.[e] In his opening address, Cranmer recommended that the reformation should be carried forward, and that the clergy should keep close by the Holy Scriptures.[f] Petitions were presented by the prolocutor to the archbishop, of which one was, that provision should be made for the examination of the ecclesiastical law, according to the act of the late king to that effect. Another was somewhat singular, for it was a prayer that the lower clergy might be adjoined and associated with the house of commons; "or else, that all such statutes and ordinances as shall be made concerning all matters of religion and causes ecclesiastical may not pass without the sight and assent of the said clergy." In the seventh session a committee was nominated to carry out the petition: "That the petition made to have this house adjoyned to the lower house of the parliament may be obtained."

[c] The Primer of 1545 was published in 4to, 8vo, and 12mo, and in English and Latin. This book has sometimes been regarded as that of 1535, with some alterations. All three were published by the late Dr. Burton.

[d] Fuller, vii. 371.

[e] Wake's State, 494; Wilkins' Concilia, iv. 15, 17. The convocation of York also met. Ibid. 26; Wake's State, 494.

[f] Collier, ii. 233; Wake's State, 592, 593; Burnet, vol. ii. part 1.

There was also another, praying that the works of the bishops and others, who, by order of convocation, had laboured in examining, reforming, and publishing the divine service, might be produced and laid before the lower house. They state that, as they were informed, certain books had been made. It is evident that the arrangement of the Liturgy had already been commenced by the bishops. In the *fifth* and *sixth* sessions the communion was ordered to be received in both kinds. The prolocutor and other members signed the document; and in the next session the proposal was adopted.[g] In the *eighth* session the question of the celibacy of the clergy was introduced; and proceeding to a vote, fifty-three voted for the repeal of all the prohibitory enactments, while twenty-two were opposed to any change whatever.[h]

No mention is made in the records of the times of any service for the solemnization of marriage previous to the *form* in the first liturgy of King Edward, A.D. 1549; nor is it any where stated, as far as I am aware, what was the method adopted during the interval between Edward's accession and the publication of the Book of Common Prayer,—whether the old service was in every particular used, or whether some deviations were permitted. I am

[g] Strype's Cranmer, i. 221; Collier, ii. 233, 235. In Cranmer's Papers the account is more explicit. "Where the clergy in the present convocation have made humble suit unto the most Reverend Father in God, my Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and all other bishops, that it may please them to be a mean to the king's majesty; and the Lord Protector's grace that the said clergy, according to the term of the king's writ and the ancient laws and customs of the realm, might have their room and place, and be associated with the Commons in the nether house of this present parliament." If this cannot be granted, "that no laws concerning the Christian religion, of what shall concern especially the persons, possessions, livings, &c. of the said clergy, may pass, nor be enacted, the said clergy not being made privy thereunto." "Item. Determined that (no man speaking against it) the communion should be administered in both kinds." Tenison Mss. 751, 123-126.

[h] Edward issued injunctions and visitation articles by virtue of the supremacy conferred by convocation, and confirmed by parliament. During a royal visitation, all other jurisdiction ceased. Atterbury, 194, 195; Strype's Cranmer, i. 220, 223; Stillingfleet's Irenicum, 387, 389.

unable to solve the question; but I have a small volume of the early part of the reign of Edward VI., which appears to me to reflect some light upon the subject.[1] It is without date; but my copy, which was formerly in the possession of Herbert, and which was used by him in editing the work of Ames, having his usual mark on the foot of the title, has a written date, 1548. It must have been published early in that year, for it recognises marriage as a sacrament; so that it was put forth at the very dawn of the Reformation under King Edward. The internal evidence shews that it was not published prior to the Reformation, since the deliverance from popery is expressed in terms which cannot be mistaken. On every account the volume is interesting and curious. Some parts of it are very similar to portions of our present marriage-service. If I may be allowed to hazard an opinion, it is this—that this *order* was used for a short time previous to the publication of the first liturgy of King Edward. No mention is, however, made of it; but the fact that such a volume was published at such a time and on such a subject may be regarded as evidence that it was used in the solemnization of marriage previous to the year 1549. It may have been used as an address to the parties, in addition to the old service, occupying the place of the homily at the end of our present service. But that it was used in some way or other may, in my opinion, be taken for granted. This opinion derives some support from the rubric before the exhortation as it stood in the Book of Common Prayer previous to the last review, in which it is enjoined that "after the Gospel shall be said a sermon, wherein ordinarily the office of a man and wife shall be declared, according to Holy Scripture."

From the first Act of Uniformity it is evident that

[1] The Order of Matrimony. Hebre. xiii. Let Wedlocke be had in pryce in all poyntes, and let the chamber be undefyled. Imprinted at London by Anthony Scoloker, dwelling in the Savoy Rentes, without Temple-barre. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.

various forms were used before the Book of Common Prayer was published. It is so stated in the act, the king not interposing. As marriage was one of the ordinary services, it seems probable that such of the clergy as objected to the *Sarum use* would only adopt such portions as they might approve. Nor can it be doubted, with the evidence of the Act of Uniformity before us, and the existence of this book, that it was actually used in some churches previous to the publication of the Book of Common Prayer. The act speaks of "other sacraments;" and in this "order" marriage is called a sacrament.[j]

The convocation having declared in favour of the communion in both kinds, an act of parliament was soon passed authorising the changing of the *mass* into a communion, and ordering that the cup should be administered to the laity. An *Order of Communion* was accordingly drawn up by a committee of bishops and divines.[k] Previous, however, to the publication of the book, a series of questions was proposed relative to this sacrament. The book was published A.D. 1548. This was the first step taken in this reign (unless we reckon the *order* of matrimony) in the reformation of the public services.[l]

A committee of bishops and divines, the same, or nearly so, as the preceding, was ordered by the king to revise the entire services of the Church. They assembled, in obedience to the royal order; and the result of their

[j] Strype's Memorials, II. i. 131, 134; Gibson's Codex, 259, 260. After alluding to the various "uses" previous to the Reformation, Strype says, "Those that liked not any of these popish forms and Latin prayers, used other English forms according as their own fancy led them." The same is declared in the act. From the accession of Edward, individuals began to adopt such forms as they approved; and thus very early a proclamation was issued against innovations. In short, this disposition to act for themselves, on the part of many, led to the compilation of the Prayer-Book.

[k] Collier, ii. 243; Sparrow's Rationale, by Downes.

[l] The First Communion-book may be seen in Sparrow's Collections, in Mason's Works, in Hicks's Christian Priesthood, in Le Strange's Alliance of Divine Offices, and in Wilkins. It is also printed by Dr. Cardwell and by the Parker Society.

labours was the first Service-book of King Edward, which, though not prepared in, was approved by, the convocation, and was afterwards set forth by authority of parliament, A.D. 1549.[m] It has, indeed, been disputed whether the liturgy was actually sanctioned by convocation; but the testimony on the point is so decisive that all doubts are removed. It was confirmed by both houses, so that it had the most complete ecclesiastical sanction. At the same time, it may be observed, that whatever was transacted by virtue of the royal supremacy had the virtual sanction of the convocation, inasmuch as the supremacy was conceded to the crown by the convocation itself.[n] It would be foreign to the object of this work, which is intended to detail the proceedings of convocation, to enter into any examination of this first liturgy of the Anglican Church. The business was primarily managed in committees; and the approval of convocation and the sanction of parliament came afterwards. The Romish assertion, therefore, that these things were settled only by parliament, is altogether groundless.[o]

The first edition of the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 was published in March of that year. It has been usual to consider the edition of May to be the first, and

[m] Strype's Memorials, II. i. 127.

[n] Heylin's Tracts, 40, 41. The Book of Common Prayer was merely submitted to parliament after its preparation, "not for preparation." "The making of one uniform order was the work of the clergy; the making of the penalties was the work of the parliament." Ib. 15, 16. King Edward distinctly states, in his answer to the Devonshire petition, that the Book of Common Prayer was sanctioned by convocation. It is also stated by Edward in a letter. Foxe, 1305, 1306; Atterbury, 200, 201. In Bonner's Register the letter is preserved; and it states that the book was approved or set forth by the bishops and all other learned men "of this our realm in their synods and convocations provincial." As the acts of convocation are lost, facts are only to be ascertained from other sources. The evidence is, however, complete.

[o] Strype's Memorials, II. i. 134; Fuller, b. vii. 386; Sparrow, by Downes. The original compilers were Cranmer, Ridley, Goodrich, Holbech, Skip, Thirlby, Day, Taylor, Cox, May, Robertson, Heynes, Redmayne. The same individuals were also engaged in the revision of the book. A Discourse concerning the Ecclesiastical Commission, 4to, 1689, pp. 24, 25.

that of March, from the custom of beginning the year on the 25th of March, to belong to the year 1550. It has been said also that there was not time to get the book ready by March. The opinion, therefore, has been general, that the May book was the first.

But the historical evidence, which appears to have escaped the notice of all those who have paid attention to this subject, is direct and conclusive in favour of the March book, which, according to the general practice of the period, would have been dated 1548-1549. The book was actually used in the London churches on Easter-day, which fell in that year on the 21st of April.[p] This was in

[p] "After Easter beganne the service in English in divers churches, and at Whitsuntide at Paules by the commaundement of the dean." Stowe, 1038. "At Easter some began to officiate by it, followed by others, as soon as books could be provided." Heylin's Eccles. Rest., 74. The act says, "that all such parishes, where the said books shall be attained and gotten before the said Feast of Pentecost, shall, within three weeks next after the said books so attained and gotten, use the said service." As the book came out on the 7th of March, the London parishes had time to get the book and to wait three weeks, and yet begin to use it on the 21st of April. "A book has now been published a month or two back which the English churches received with great satisfaction." This is from a letter written from Cambridge on the 5th of June. It had then been published a month or two; and as such an expression is usually interpreted to mean the longer period, we may infer that the writer had seen the book in Cambridge early in April—at all events he could not refer to the May edition. Original Letters, Parker Society, 350. There is another letter from Lambeth written by Bucer and Fagius, dated the 26th of April, 1549, in which they say, "The cause of religion, as far as appertains to the establishment of doctrines and the definition of rites, is pretty near what could be wished. As soon as the description of the ceremonies now in use shall have been translated into Latin, we will send it to you." Ib. 535. From this passage it appears certain that the book was now used at Lambeth. It would appear, moreover, from the complaints of the Devonshire and Cornish rebels, that the book was known in the West before Whitsunday, or the 9th of June. The rising occurred about the 10th of June. The May book could scarcely have been circulated in Cornwall so as to form a pretext for rebellion by the 10th of June. In the king's answer, dated July 8th, the Prayer-Book is alluded to as one of their causes of complaint. The book mentioned Sundays and holydays for baptism, and the people imagined that the sacrament could be administered on no other day. The king replies, that the sacrament might be administered at any time, as pre-

accordance with the act, which allowed its use before the Feast of Pentecost, wherever copies could be procured.

---

vious to the Reformation. The people also complained of confirmation; to whom the king answers, "How did ye all learn before the Pater noster, Ave, and Credo in Latin, which ye did not understand?" Some objected because the book was not in the Cornish language; and the king asks, "Why should they now be offended more, when they understand it not in English, than when they had it in Latin and understood it not?" As this answer from the king was dated July 8th, it is obvious that the book must have been circulated in the West some time before the rebellion actually broke out, which was on the 10th of June. In short, copies of the March edition must have reached Cornwall. Tytler quotes the king's answer of July 8th, adding that the document had escaped the researches of Strype and Burnet. This is, however, a mistake. Strype alludes to the answer, and Burnet and Foxe give it in a more correct form than in Tytler. As his copy was not signed, it is clear that it possessed no authority. It is too much to assert that the document had escaped the notice of others, as the expression implies that they do not give the facts; whereas they cite the authorised document, while the copy alluded to by Tytler is only a draft. In Cranmer's answer to the rebels, the same line is taken; so that it is evident that both documents were drawn up by the archbishop. Tytler's England under the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary, i. 180, 181; Burnet, II. i. b. 1; Foxe, 1005-1007. On the 23d of July, Bonner was charged with negligence in not enforcing the use of the book. In some places it was not even known or not used, or only seldom, or in such a manner that the people could not understand it. Foxe, 1003. Archbishop Williams states that the first book was published March 7th, 1549; and that the year 1548-49, and not 1549-50, was intended, is clear from his allusion to a letter written between November 1548 and January 1549, "before the publishing of the first Liturgie." The Holy Table, Name, and Thing, &c. printed for the diocese of Lincoln, 1637, pp. 143, 145. It is clear, therefore, that no fixed rule was followed by printers in dating books. They probably, after January, even though the year did not end till March, used the ensuing date; just as now it is not unusual to affix the date of the following year to works published late in the autumn.

These particulars collectively afford a body of evidence of so conclusive a character, that no doubt can remain respecting the first edition. This evidence is alluded to by the writer in a life of Jeremy Collier, prefixed to a new edition of his Ecclesiastical History, in nine volumes, published by Straker. Mr. Pickering has long expressed an opinion, grounded on the evidences of haste in the printing, such as different sets of signatures, proving that the work had been entrusted to different printers, that one of the March books was the first edition; but no direct evidence, as far as I am aware, was adduced, until I collected it in the life of Collier.

Copies of the book were ready on April 21st; and in London it was actually used, though not at St. Paul's, where it was not introduced until Whitsunday, the day fixed by the act. The evidence is decisive. The Book of Common Prayer was read in the London churches some time before the publication of the May edition.

In the convocation in 1550 the question of a revision of the liturgy was entertained; and the words at the delivery of the elements to the communicants were especially considered.[q] Subsequent to the publication of the book of 1549, the same committee of bishops and divines drew up a *Form for the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, which bears the date of March 1549. At this time the year was reckoned from the 25th of March; so that books published before that date, or between the *first* of January and the 25th of March, were sometimes dated in the year that was closing, and which, according to our computation, had closed, or in the year that was commencing. An act of parliament had previously passed to authorise the preparation of the service, and giving it the force of law when completed.[r] In the year 1552, the liturgy was published in a revised form; and the *Ordination Service* was added to the book. Some few changes were made on its being incorporated with the book of Common Prayer, but they were not material.[s]

[q] Collier, ii. 310; Heylin's Hist. Ref. 107; Cardwell's Two Liturgies compared, pref. xviii. "The prelates and other divines that compiled our forms of ordination did it by virtue of the authority they had from Christ as pastors of his Church. When it pleased God to turn the hearts of those that had the chief power, then they did acknowledge so great a blessing, and accept and improve the authority of the civil powers for adding the sanction of a law to the reformation." "So by the authority they derived from Christ, and the warrant they had from Scripture and the primitive Church, these prelates and divines made their alterations in the Ordinal, and the king and parliament added their authority to make them obligatory on the subject." Burnet's Vindication of the Orders of the Church of England, 53, 54.

[r] Collier, ii. 288, who gives the act. See also Burnet, vol. ii. part i.

[s] Burnet, art. xxxvi.; Collier, ii. 291; Ridley's Life, 340. The most important alteration was the omission of the words at the end of the oath of

The year 1552 is memorable in our ecclesiastical history for the publication of the *Articles of Religion*. They were *forty-two* in number, and were drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, with the assistance of some other divines. The archbishop admitted, in the time of Queen Mary, that the Catechism, the Articles, and the book against Gardiner, "were his doings."[t] The articles were submitted to the convocation, by whom they were ratified and confirmed. This great work was commenced by the archbishop in 1551; and in 1552 the articles were published by due authority. It has been supposed by some persons, that the

supremacy, after "So help me God, *all saints and holy evangelists.*" Le Strange's Alliance of Divine Offices; Sparrow, by Downes; Collier, ii. 310; Strype's Memorials, II. ii. 20, 21; Cardwell's Two Liturgies compared; Keeling. Some copies of the Book of Common Prayer of 1552 have an interpolated rubric at the end of the Communion-service relative to kneeling. It is not in either of the copies by Whitchurch in the Bodleian; but it is found in the copies by Grafton. The act of parliament by which the book was ratified passed in April 1552; but in September "an order came to Grafton in any wise to stay from uttering any of the books." If any were distributed to the Company of Stationers, they were not to be circulated. The order for inserting the rubric is in the Har. Coll., and is dated October 27th, 1552. It was a letter to the Lord Chancellor. The book was printed two months before the order was issued, so that the sheet must have been cancelled in the copies which were not in circulation. It occurs in three copies in my possession. Strype's Mem. II. ii. 20; ib. Cranmer, 416. Bancroft, in reply to the Puritans, says of the Order of Communion and the two Prayer-Books, "notwithstanding it was then carefully compiled and confirmed by a synod, yet, by and by, after (that I may use Master Foxe's words), *through the obstinate and dissembling malice of many*, it was impugned. Thereupon it was again reviewed, and after published with such approbation as that it was accounted the worke of God." He observes, that objections were still raised, and that Cranmer procured a Latin translation for Bucer's judgment, and then a review of the book. John Ould wrote in defence of the second book against the Papists; and Cranmer offered to prove it "to be in effect the verie same *quæ fuit ante annos* 1500, which was above 1500 yeeres ago." Ridley, in his prison, hearing from Grindal of Knox at Frankfort, said, "Alas that brother Knoxe could not bear with our Booke of Common Praier!" Bancroft's Sermon, 1588, pp. 51-56. From Bancroft's account, therefore, we learn that "The Order of Communion" was duly authorised by the synod.

[t] Strype's Cranmer, i. 390.

articles of 1552 were not sanctioned by convocation; but the evidence on the subject appears to be conclusive.[u] They were prepared by the archbishop; and though not debated in convocation, they were sanctioned and subscribed by both houses. It is not probable that the title would have put forth a falsehood, which would have been the case had they not been ratified by convocation: "Articles agreed upon by the Bishops and other learned and godly men in the last Convocation at London, in the year of our Lord 1552, to root out the discord of opinions, and establish the agreement of true religion. Published by the King's Majestie's authority, 1553." It is evident therefore that they were confirmed in the convocation, and then published by command of his majesty.[v] "The title none durst have adventured to set before them, had they not really been the products of that convocation. The truth is, that the records of convocation during this reign are very imperfect; most of them lost; and yet one might conclude as strongly that my mother died childless, because my christening is not to be found in the parish register, as that the convocation of this year was barren, because the acts and articles of it are not entered in the journal-book."[w]

The catechism usually known in history as King Edward's appears also to have been set forth by this convocation. It was intended for the instruction of children in the fundamentals of religion. Its author was supposed to be Poynet, bishop of Winchester.[x] The subject was

[u] Wilkins, iv. 73.

[v] Strype's Cranmer, i. 390; Memorials, II. ii. 24; Wilkins, iv. 73-77; Burnet's Records; Heylin's Reformation, 121, and Appendix; ib. Tracts, 13; Lawrence's Bampton Lectures; Wake's State, &c. 597-600; Fuller, vii. 421; Cardwell's Synodalia, II. i. 1-7.

[w] Heylin's Examen, 122, 123.

[x] Strype's Memorials, II. ii. 24. They are mentioned in the acts of convocation, 1562, as having been sanctioned in 1552. Wake has fully proved that they were duly sanctioned. They "were agreed to in convocation, and there subscribed by both houses." The author of *Priestcraft in Perfection*,

mentioned in Queen Mary's reign by Weston, the prolocutor of the lower house at Oxford, who asserted that it had never been authorised by the synod. On that occasion he introduced a bill declaring it *pestiferous and full of heresies*, and that it was foisted fraudulently upon

Neal, and others, and even Dr. Lamb, have asserted that they were never so sanctioned. Thus they would lead us to infer, not only that the title is false, but that the convocation of 1552 was either mistaken, or had uttered a falsehood. Wake's State, 599, 600; Madox's Vindication, 309. Lambe. The registers of the period are all very deficient; yet the evidence is conclusive. Atterbury quoted a MS. copy of the acts of convocation in 1562, in which it is stated that they were duly authorised in 1552. Burnet boldly called this journal a forgery. "With submission to his lordship," says Nichols, "I think it was a little too severe to tax Dr. Atterbury or the writer of the MS. with forgery; but to charge such a shuffling trick upon a pious prince and his ministers, to whom we owe the benefits of our Reformation, and upon the most eminent of the Protestant clergy, many of whom laid down their lives for our common religion, is a degree of incaution which one would not have expected from his lordship's prudence and moderation. For the words which he cites are not only found in the transcript he made use of, but in the very original acts themselves, as I find them published by Dr. Gibson in his *Synodus Anglicana*, p. 192, without the diminution of a letter or a syllable; so that the evidence produced by Dr. Atterbury still stands good, notwithstanding his lordship's impeachment; and we have the authority of convocation of 1562 to prove that the first edition of the articles were in Synodo Londinensi editi. But supposing the trick had been played, which his lordship suggests, would Queen Elizabeth's convocation have ventured to have overhauled this matter again ten years after, and have vindicated a fraud which was notorious to all the popish bishops and clergy? It was sufficient proof of these articles being some way or other passed in convocation, as served to silence all objections of the papists ten years afterwards, and settled this matter so as hardly any one since has ventured to dispute it." Nichols's Commentary on the Articles, p. 2. Heylin affirms that they were prepared by Cranmer and others, and then submitted to the synod. "It is to be observed that the Church of England, in the first five years of King Edward, retained these articles and no other, which certainly she had not done had they been commended to her by a less authority than a convocation." Eccles. Res. 121, 122. Burnet's assertion of forgery was very rash, and Atterbury's MS. was confirmed by Gibson's. After the evidence of the acts of convocation in 1562, in which their authority is asserted, it seems almost inconceivable that any one should entertain a doubt on the subject. Atterbury, 206, 408; Syn. Ang. 192, 193. Atterbury says: "The only reason he has pleased to give is, that the major part of the synods could not have agreed to 'em without a miracle. However, since the acts of ano-

the late synod, and that it was disowned by the present. This bill was subscribed by all the members of the lower house, with the exception of six. Philpot, however, archdeacon of Winchester, rose and stated, that the synod, under King Edward, had granted certain powers to the persons appointed by the king, and that consequently their acts were to be regarded as those of the convocation; so that the catechism had the authority which was claimed for it. It appears that a license for the printing of the work was granted in September 1552, though it was not published until the next year. Strype conjectures that it was delayed for the purpose of obtaining the sanction of the convocation.[y]

ther synod ten years afterwards assure us that such a miracle was done, we have reason, I think, to take their word before my lord of Sarum's conjecture." Atterbury, 408. Mr. Trevor says that Heylin concurs with Burnet; but this is a mistake. Trevor, p. 66. At the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth some Puritan ministers objected to the prescribed vestments, and they were charged with their subscription to these articles of 1552. Some of the petitioners had actually subscribed in convocation. The fact was evident, and no attempt at denial was made. Wake's State, 599, 600. Fuller calls this a barren convocation; but he evidently referred to the journals, which were almost a blank, containing little more than the names. vii. 420, 421; Appeal of Injured Innocence, part ii. 78. He adds that this barren convocation was the parent of the articles. The convocation met in 1548; in Canterbury it was prorogued to 1549, then to 1550, and continued to 1551 and 1552, when the articles were arranged. Wilkins, iv. 26, 32, 60, 68, 73. "Nor was there any thing done in that reformation but either by the clergy in their convocations, and in their convocations rightly and canonically constituted, or with the counsel and advice of the heads thereof in more private conferences; the parliaments of these times contributing very little towards it, but acquiescing in the wisdom of the sovereign princes, and in the piety of the ghostly fathers." Heylin's Tracts, 5; Wilkins, iv. 73-77. The Puritans objected that our reformation was effected by regal, the Papists by parliamentary authority. "Put all which hath been said together, and the sum is this: that the proceedings of this Church in the reformation were not merely regal (as it is objected by some Puritans), much less that they were parliamentarian, as the Papists falsely charge upon us; the parliaments doing little, but the work being done synodically by the clergy only; the king concurring either by his own single act, in letters-patent, proclamations, and injunctions, or by some public act of state." Heylin's Tracts, 17.

[y] Strype's Cranmer, i. 423; Memorials, II. ii. 24, 25; Heylin's Tracts, 13; Tenison Mss. vol. 751.

The convocation of York did little, as far as we can ascertain, except grant subsidies to the crown.[z]

The doctrine of *transubstantiation* was now renounced by the Anglican Church. We have already seen its gradual introduction into England; but the public in our day know but little of the gross superstition to which this doctrine gave rise. The words of consecration were spoken in a tone not to be heard by the people; and, to satisfy the public, the most absurd stories were invented. One reason assigned for repeating the words of consecration so as not to be heard was this, that certain shepherds having heard the words from a priest, repeated them over their own food, when it immediately turned into flesh. At first the custom was to consecrate a whole loaf, and on its distribution the people were taught to believe, that each received a portion of the Saviour's actual body; but afterwards the schoolmen and others taught that the entire body of Christ was in every particle of the consecrated bread, so that when any portion was divided a new body was produced in all the separate parts. To get rid of the difficulty attending the question, the Romanists at length introduced wafers, in order that no particle might be separated.

The *first* book of Homilies was published A.D. 1547. It is frequently objected that the Homilies were not set forth by authority of the Church, inasmuch as they were not sanctioned formally by the convocation. The objection is, however, futile; for in the *forty-two* articles of King Edward the book of Homilies is mentioned and confirmed. "*Of Homilies*—The Homilies of late given and set out by the king's authority be godly and whole-

[z] Wake's State, 495. We have various forms or directories for holding convocations. That for 1552 is as follows: "Directorie for the first day of the convocation. The order of the convocation in Paul's quire. A sermon. Return to the chapter-house. Bishop of London to exhibit a certificate of the execution of the summons. The archbishop to depute his chancellor to receive the certificates. The clergy to be called. The archbishop to declare the cause of the convocation" Tenison Mss. vol. 751.

some, containing doctrine to be received of all men, and therefore are to be read to the people diligently, distinctly, and plainly." As these articles were set forth by authority of convocation, it must be admitted that the Homilies, which were then published, were sanctioned by the authority of the Church.

The history of the Homilies is both curious and interesting. We find various allusions to them in the reign of Henry VIII.: nor can there be any doubt that the first book was prepared in convocation some years before Edward's accession. It was evidently the impression at the time that Cranmer was their author; and that some were his composition, while the rest were submitted to his inspection, is a well-ascertained fact. Gardiner attributes the "Homily of Salvation" to the archbishop. A very curious correspondence is preserved in the first edition of Foxe, in which Gardiner frequently speaks of Cranmer and the Homilies. This correspondence is not given in the subsequent editions of "The Martyrology," the author referring to it only as existing in his first impression, and stating that it was omitted on account of its length. Gardiner well knew how, and by whom, the Homilies were composed. They were introduced into convocation in the year 1542. Writing in 1547, Gardiner says, that he had received a letter from Cranmer "touching certain Homilies which the bishops in the convocation holden anno 1542 agreed to make;" and then he speaks of other letters, "requiring the said Homilies by virtue of a convocation holden five years past." The bishop objected to their authority, on the ground that they wanted the royal sanction. Cranmer evidently regarded them as having been authorised by convocation. From the first edition of Foxe much information on the subject may be obtained. Gardiner was summoned on one occasion before Cranmer and certain bishops; and he tells us, that it was when the archbishop "was in hand with his Homily of salvation. My Lord of Canterbury charged me, that I like nothing

unless I do it myself; whereof I am not guilty. I was never autor of any one thing other spiritual or temporal· I thank God of it. I am also charged that all the realm hath receaved these Homilies without contradiction, save I; whereunto I answere, I think they have not red that I have red in these books." The books themselves were authorised by convocation under Henry, and wanted only the royal confirmation, which was granted by King Edward.[a]

The convocation of Canterbury was summoned in March 1553, and dissolved in April. It was again called for the 19th of September, before which time King Edward died.[b] Mary succeeded to the throne on her brother's death in 1553. The convocation was assembled in October, "which," says Strype, "was so packed or so compliant, that six only of the whole house" (meaning the lower house) "owned King Edward's reformation."[c] Harpsfield, chaplain to the Bishop of London, preached the usual sermon, taking the text in the xxth of Acts: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." The proceedings of the reformers in the preceding reign were condemned by the preacher in no gentle strain. After sermon, the usual instructions were given for the choice of a prolocutor of the lower house, and Weston, dean of Westminster, was chosen to the office. By command of the queen, a public

[a] Foxe, ed. 1563, pp. 728-804; and compare with the ed. 1583, p. 1340. Strype's Mem. I. 573-581. "Feb. 2, 1541, Illic tractavit de homiliis conficiendis. April 3, Reverendissimus tractavit de homiliis. Feb. 6, 1542, Prolocutor exhibitis nonnullis homiliis a quibusdam prælatis compositis petitionem præsentavit de legibus ecclesiasticis conficiendis juxta statutum in ea parte habitum. Feb. 16, 1542, Illic prolatæ sunt homiliæ per quosdam prælatos de diversis materiis." Wilkins, iv. 862, 863; Wake's State, 591; Atterbury's Rights, &c. 195, 196. My object is simply to prove the convocational authority of the Homilies, and not to settle the question of authorship. For the latter I may refer the reader to Cranmer's Works by Jenkyns, and the Cambridge edition of the Homilies by Corrie.

[b] Wilkins, iv. 88.

[c] Strype's Cranmer, i. 461; Wake's State, 495; Wilkins, iv. 88. The province of York was also assembled. Ib.

disputation was held in St. Paul's church on the *real presence*, when Philpot, Haddon, Aylmer, and others, defended the views of the reformers. The decision of the convocation was, of course, in favour of Romanism. The upper house decided that the body and blood of Christ were actually present in the sacrament under the species of bread and wine, and that a change, expressed by the word *transubstantiation*, actually took place in the consecration of the elements.[d]

The convocation had been summoned in order that the question relative to the state of the Church might be discussed before any measure should be submitted to parliament; and it is observable, that in the writ the queen retained the title of *supreme head* of the Church of England. Cranmer was in prison at the time, yet the writ was issued as usual to him; but Bonner, as Bishop of London, acted as president.[e] Philpot in vain requested that some of the divines who had been concerned in drawing up the articles of religion might be associated with them in the discussion. The discussion on the sacrament, after six days' debate, ended amidst great confusion in the lower house, Weston saying, "It is not the queen's pleasure that we should spend any longer time in these debates; and ye are well enough already, for ye have the word, and we have the sword."[f]

After it had been decided that another discussion should take place between certain Romanists, and Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, on questions framed by the convocation, it was settled that Oxford should be the arena in which the contest should be managed. Weston, the prolocutor, and certain members of the lower house, were

[d] Strype's Cranmer, i. 461; Strype's Memorials, III. i. 73; Fuller, viii. 11; Wake's State, 601; Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 29. This convocation was dissolved in December. Wilkins, iv. 88.

[e] Wake's State, 495, 601; Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 29.

[f] Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 29, 30; Collier, ii. 354-358; Foxe, Burnet.

deputed as a committee to represent the clergy in Oxford. The University of Cambridge sent seven of their body as their representatives; and to the whole were added, by commission, the vice-chancellor and other members of the University of Oxford. Cranmer was summoned to appear before this mixed assembly in the choir of St. Mary's church; and after his removal, Ridley and Latimer were successively introduced. It seems that the prolocutor and his companions arrived in Oxford on the 13th of April, 1554, and returned on the 23d of the same month, after Cranmer and his brethren had been condemned as heretics. This was the second convocation of Mary's reign, summoned with her second parliament. The queen's writ directed them to meet on the 3d of April at Oxford, from which city it was adjourned to London. It was, however, adjourned during the disputes in Oxford. In short, the only business transacted related to the management of the discussions; and on his return from Oxford, Weston submitted to the lower house a report of the proceedings with Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer.[g]

The same year Queen Mary convened her third parliament. The convocation also was summoned by a writ to the dean and chapter of Canterbury, and met November 13th, under the presidency of Bonner. It continued to sit until the 26th of February. During its sessions, Cardinal Pole, whose attainder had been removed by act of parliament, came over to England as *legate a latere* from the pope. The ceremony of reconciliation to the see of Rome was performed with great pomp. The convocation petitioned the king and queen to interpose in their behalf; and the cardinal, having sent for both houses to meet him at Lambeth, absolved them from all their perjuries, schisms, and heresies, on the 6th day of December, 1554.

[g] Strype's Cranmer, 480-486; Mem. III. i. 74, 75; Collier, ii. 367; Wake's State, 496, 601; Burnet, iii. part i. b. v. This second convocation was summoned by a writ directed to Bonner, "sede archiepiscopali vacante per condemnationem Thomæ Cranmeri." Wilkins, iv. 94, 98.

The absolution was received upon their knees; and a commission was granted to the bishops to reconcile their respective dioceses.[h]

A petition was presented to the upper house from the lower, digested into twenty-eight articles, relating to matters which they wished to be reformed. They requested that heretical books should be destroyed, mentioning especially Cranmer's *book on the Sacrament*, and the *schismatical Communion-book*, with all *suspicious translations of the Bible*, and the *English ordinal*. They also prayed for the revival of the statute concerning heresy. When it was observed, that some had already been committed to the flames, even though there were no law to condemn them, Weston replied: "It forceth not for a law: we have a commission to proceed with them; and when they be despatched, let their friends sue the law."[i] It is surprising that any copies of the Book of Common Prayer should have escaped destruction; for there can be no doubt that the authorities were very active in removing them from all churches, and in destroying them whenever they could meet with them, either in public or private.

The next convocation of this reign, being the fourth, assembled on the 22d of October, 1555.[j] Dr. Christopherson was appointed prolocutor of the lower house. In the upper house the bishop of Ely proposed that certain individuals should be chosen from the house to review the ancient canons, for the purpose of accommodating them to the present state of the Church. The result, however, is not known.[k] Little business was transacted, since Pole's

[h] Wake's State, 496; Strype's Cranmer, i. 495; Memorials, III. i. 253-255; Wilkins, iv. 111, 112. There was a procession to return thanks for being brought back to the "Catholic faith!" Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 44, 51, 52.

[i] Strype's Cranmer, i. 500, 501; Burnet, ii. 1, book ii.; Wilkins, iv. 95-97.

[j] Wake's State, 496; Wilkins, iv. 120.

[k] Heylin's Hist. Ref. part ii. 54. It was prorogued to November, before which time Pole had summoned the two provinces to a legantine synod to be

legantine synod of the whole kingdom was summoned to meet in December. According to Burnet, the last session was on the 15th of November, and a memorandum was inserted as follows: "After this convocation was begun, there was a national synod, the clergy of York being joined with them."[l] Some confusion has arisen, in consequence of not distinguishing between the regular convocation of the province of Canterbury and Pole's legantine council. After the 15th of November, the business appears to have been managed in the latter assembly. Both councils were manifestly sitting at the same time; that is, on certain days when the legantine council did not sit, the bishops and clergy met in convocation, though merely to be prorogued.[m] Such at least was the case for a time; but it is by no means easy to distinguish the proceedings of the two assemblies.

Pole deemed it necessary to procure a warrant from the queen before he summoned his synod. It was dated November 2d, 1555. It would seem that the clergy were fearful of a *præmunire*, or the cardinal would not have solicited permission to hold a council, which the papal legates had always summoned by their own authority.[n] The cardinal prepared a body of constitutions, which were sanctioned by the synod. By the *first* it is enjoined, that there should be a constant remembrance, in every mass, of the reconciliation of the country to the see of Rome, and that a *procession* should take place on its anniversary.

held in December. The convocation petitioned the king and queen to intercede with the cardinal, that church lands might not be restored. Heylin's Eccles. Rest. 43, 44. "The sacrilege committed at the Reformation (though chiefly by those who were not of the reformed religion) was the most popular argument on the popish side." Kennet's Impropriations, 139, 140. This, in Kennet's opinion, is evident from the address in 1554. "This one reason brought over the clergy so generally." Ib.

[l] Burnet, iii. 1, b. i. Some things were discussed in the convocation of Canterbury relative to the residence of the clergy. Wilkins, iv. 126. York merely met this year. Ib. 120; Tenison Mss. 751.

[m] Wilkins, iv. 142.

[n] Ib. iv. 130-132; Wake's State, 498; Harmer's Specimen, &c. 142.

Several of them contained useful and important matters; and it is evident that Pole had profited by what had occurred in England during the progress of the Reformation. It is remarkable that the *Institution of a Christian Man* was examined, and that a translation of the New Testament was ordered.[o] This council was continued, by several prorogations, until 1557. It was the last legantine synod held in England.[p]

Mary summoned a new parliament in the last year of her reign, with which the convocation also, as was usual, assembled. Besides the grant of a subsidy, they treated of various matters of discipline, which were proposed by the clergy preparatory to presentation to the cardinal.[q] The convocation was dissolved by the death of the queen, an event that took place on the 17th day of November, A.D. 1558.[r] In the province of York little if any business was transacted during this reign.

[o] Wilkins, iv. 132. After Pole's death, the constitutions of the legantine synod were published at Rome. "Reformatio Angliæ ex Decretis Reginaldi Poli Cardinalis sedis apostolicæ Legati. Anno 1556. Romæ, 1562." Wilkins, iv 121-126. The convocation of the province was continued by various prorogations during the legantine council. Wilkins, iv. 142; Wake's State, 499.

[p] Wake's State, 497-499; App. 228-230; Strype's Cranmer, i. 528; Tenison Mss. 751; Burnet, II. i. b. i.; ib. III. i. b. v; Labb. et Coss. xiv. 1733. This is the only Anglican council inserted in Labb. et Coss. after the Reformation. Wilkins, iv. 151.

[q] Wilkins, iv. 155-168; Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 77, 78. Irregular marriages were the subject of complaint, especially such as were celebrated at the chapel of the Tower.

[r] Wake's State, 499; Wilkins, iv. 178.

CHAPTER VII.

A.D. 1558-1602.

Elizabeth — Cautious proceedings — Litany — Convocation — Disputation — Supremacy — Heresy — Common Prayer — Common Prayer in Scotland — Eleven Articles — Thirty-nine Articles — Proceedings in Convocation — Nowell's Catechism — Jewell's Apology — Homilies — Lessons — Admonition respecting Lessons in Second Book of Homilies — Visitation Articles, 1563 — Convocation of 1571 — Articles — Subscription — Apostolical Succession — The disputed clause in the XXth Article — Canons of this Year — Foxe's Martyrology — Reformatio Legum — Canons, 1575 — Lay Baptism — Articuli pro Clero, 1584 — Orders for the Clergy — Puritan Prayer-Book — Proceedings in Convocation — Canons in 1597 — Death of the Queen.

The *seventeenth* day of November was long observed by the English Church and nation as a day of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne of these realms. Nor can we feel surprise that our ancestors should have so regarded it, when we remember the evils from which they were rescued by Elizabeth's accession. It was an event which procured the deliverance of many sufferers both from death and from prison. "The 17th of November, 1558," says Stow, "came certain news into the parliament house of the death of Queene Marie, whereat many rejoiced, and many lamented."

Much caution was observed by the government in commencing the work of reformation. No sudden step was taken, for the queen intended to proceed deliberately, yet firmly, in removing that system which had been re-established by Queen Mary. Members of the Anglican Church can never be too thankful that the Reformation was carried on with so much prudence. Had less discrimination and caution marked the steps of the government at this important period, the Anglican Reformation might have been conducted on principles similar to those which

were adopted by the continental reformers, and the consequence might have been the renunciation of the apostolic discipline and government.

On the *first* day of January, the *litany* was read in English, with the *epistle* and *gospel*. This was the first direct step towards the restoration of the primitive mode of worship. During the same month the parliament met; and all the laws enacted against Rome in the reign of Henry VIII., and which had been repealed in the late times, were renewed and brought into operation. The supremacy was therefore restored to the crown; but the title *supreme governor* was substituted for that of *supreme head*.

The convocation assembled with the parliament. A reason is quaintly assigned by Fuller why much business was not transacted at this synod: "For as it is observed in nature, when one twin is of unusual strength and bigness, the other, his partner born with him, is weak and dwindled away; so here, this parliament being very active in matters of religion, the convocation (younger brother thereunto) was little employed, and less regarded."[a] The archbishopric of Canterbury being vacant by the death of Cardinal Pole, Bonner, as Bishop of London, presided in the convocation. He addressed the assembly on the occasion; and Harpsfield, who was chosen prolocutor of the lower house, presented certain articles of religion, which he requested the bishops to submit to parliament for its confirmation. They were quite in agreement with the doctrines of Rome. It was declared, that after the words of consecration the natural body of Christ is really present in the sacrament; that the substance of bread and wine does not remain; that the true body of Christ is offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead; that the authority to govern the Church was given to Peter, and to his successors the popes, as vicars apostolic; and that the authority to define points of faith is vested in the clergy. These articles were subse-

[a] Fuller, ix. 54.

quently presented by Bonner to the lord-keeper; but no further step was taken in the business.[b]

When the convocation assembled, the queen required them not to proceed to make canons, under the penalties of a *præmunire*. But the Act of Submission had been repealed by Queen Mary, and was not yet revived; consequently the convocation might have proceeded to make canons without the queen's license, or without incurring the penalties of a *præmunire*. However, through fear of the queen's resentment, or despair of being able to effect their wishes against the views of the country and the government, they remained perfectly quiet.[c]

The declaration of the lower house, so decidedly in favour of the Romish doctrines, probably hastened on the disputation at Westminster. It commenced on the 31st of March, by order of the queen. Certain divines were selected on both sides; and the following points were proposed for discussion:—*first*, whether it is against the word of God and the custom of the ancient Church to celebrate the services in an unknown tongue; *secondly*, whether every Church has authority to decree rites and ceremonies, provided all things be done to edification; *thirdly*, whether it can be proved by the word of God, that there is offered in the mass a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead.

In order to preserve quiet and to prevent confusion, the lord-keeper acted as chairman on this occasion. At the first meeting the Romanists had no written paper, though it had been agreed that the debate should be managed in writing. They stated that they had been mis-

[b] Fuller, ix. 55, 56; Collier, ii. 413, 414; Strype's Annals, I. i. 80-82; Burnet, iii. 1, b. vi.; Wilkins, iv. 179, 180; Tenison Mss. 751.

[c] Wilkins, iv. 179. "Donec de beneplacito reginæ constaret," were Bonner's words. The convocation of York merely assembled. Both were prorogued in 1559. Ib. 181, 182. "Such was either their fear, or modesty, or a despair of doing any good to themselves and the cause, that there was nothing done by the bishops at all, and not much more by the lower house, than a declaration of their judgment in some certain points." Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 113.

taken, but that they were ready to argue the first point *viva voce*. Cole, therefore, who acted on behalf of the Romanists, argued that the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue was not opposed to any express declaration of holy Scripture, and that were such even the case, the constant custom of the Church was not to be condemned. He illustrated his position by the change in the observance of the Sabbath, which was made by the Church, whose authority in such matters was sufficient. His conclusion was, that though the reformers might have the Scriptures on their side, yet that the Church, being always under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, was competent to settle all such questions. He also insisted much on the preservation of the unity of the Church in public worship. On the other part it was answered, that they received all the articles of the three creeds; that they were ready to refer the whole controversy to the Scriptures and to the Church; that by the Word of God they intended only the written word or the canonical Scriptures; and that by the custom of the Church they understood the general practice during the *first five* centuries. On the *second* day the Romanists were not prepared to abide by the agreement; so that the conference was abruptly terminated.[d]

The supremacy, as has been mentioned, was restored to the crown by act of parliament, entitled, *An Act restoring to the Crown the ancient Jurisdiction over the Estate Ecclesiastical and Spiritual*.[e] An oath was also framed, called the *Oath of Supremacy*, in which the doctrine propounded in the act is subscribed. The thirty-seventh article also relates to the same subject; and every clergyman subscribes the Thirty-nine Articles, together with the three articles in the thirty-sixth canon, in which the whole

[d] Collier, ii. 414-420; Foxe, ii. 2119, ed. 1583; Fuller, ix. 56, 57; Strype's Annals, I. i. 198-237; Burnet, ii. 1, b. iii.; Cardwell's Conferences, 25, 55-117.

[e] Wake's Appeal, 6; Gibson's Codex, 933.

question is involved. In the Act of Supremacy was a clause empowering the queen to erect a court of high commission, for the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It was also decided, that no one should adjudge any thing to be heresy, except such matters or views as were so determined by holy Scripture, or by the first four general councils, or by any other general council in which a point was declared to be heresy in the express words of Scripture; or such doctrines as should hereafter be so determined by authority of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation. The *first four* councils were recognised as a standard of appeal in the reign of Henry VIII., by act of parliament, and also in the *Institution of a Christian Man.* In this act there was a limitation to Scripture and the first four councils, because in the times of popery every thing was pronounced to be heresy to which the term was applied by the Church of Rome, such as speaking against *pilgrimages, images,* or *auricular confession.* The bill was opposed by the Romanists; but still it was carried into a law.[f] A bill was also introduced into the House of Commons for giving authority to *thirty-two* persons to revise the ecclesiastical laws, and to prepare a digest of them; but it was not carried in the Lords, and the canons of the Church were left in the state in which they were placed by the act of the 25th of Henry VIII.[g] As the attempt failed, nothing was done towards a review of the canons until the next reign.

In December, a committee of divines was appointed to review the Book of Common Prayer.[h] It would have been chimerical to have expected any thing from that convocation, which assembled with Elizabeth's first par-

[f] Collier, ii. 420-422; Gibson, 425; Grey's Ecclesiastical Law, 121, 122.

[g] Collier, ii. 424.

[h] They were Parker, Bill, May, Cox, Pilkington, Grindal, Whitehead, Sandys, Guest, and Sir Thomas Smith. Strype's Life of Smith, 59; Strype's Annals, i. 119; Fuller, b. vii. 386. Cox and May were two of the original compilers.

liament; and therefore the work was entrusted to a committee, consisting of ten persons, of whom four had been in exile during the reign of Mary. They finished their review in April; but some changes were subsequently made in certain portions of the book. Kneeling at the sacrament was left indifferent by the committee; but afterwards it was enjoined, as in King Edward's book. A bill for uniformity was introduced into the Commons, with the Book of Common Prayer annexed, and was passed almost immediately. There were no conferences between the two houses; no committees to examine the book; but the bill was carried on the credit of the individuals by whom the Liturgy had been revised. In the Lords several speeches were made against it; but even there the bill was speedily carried.[i] The book was first used on the 24th of June 1559.[j]

[i] Collier, ii. 430; Cardwell's Conferences, 31-38; Collier's Records, no. 77; Burnet, ii. 1, b. iii.; Strype's Annals, I. i. 122-4; Strype's Annals, I. i. 107-116.

[j] Strype says—"The 24th day of June made a great alteration, that being the day appointed from which the new service-book was to be only used in all the churches. Hitherto the Latin mass-book remained, and the priests celebrated divine service, for the most part, as they did before; that is, from November 1558 to the month of June 1559." Ibid. "Our first reformers did not undertake to make a new religion, but only to restore the old. They laid aside nothing but what was lately brought in, at least in comparison of the old doctrine and discipline, which they retained as having been taught and practised by the apostolical and primitive Church, both in the east and west, before it was corrupted." "It was found necessary to have some liturgy. But did they go about to make a new one? So far from that, they only repealed the foresaid act of repeal, and so established the former as it was left by King Edward, without innovating any thing in the substance of it, nor making any other but one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday, and the form of the litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants." Beveridge's Defence of the Psalms, &c. pp. 6, 7, 9, 10. The differences between the book of Elizabeth and that of Edward are given by Whitgift in a letter to Cecil. Strype's Ann. I. i. 223. In the Act of Uniformity they are described as an alteration of lessons, an omission in the litany, with two sentences added at the delivery of the sacramental elements. There were, however, other, though minor, alterations; and in the next reign they were frequently adduced by the Puritans in

There are some interesting facts connected with the use and reception of the Liturgy of the Anglican Church in Scotland, at the early part of the Reformation in that country. While the English exiles were disputing about the Book of Common Prayer at Frankfort, it was thankfully received by the people in Scotland, who were just emerging from the superstitions of Rome. During the reign of Queen Mary, some of the English, who were compelled to quit their own country, took shelter in Scotland, taking with them the Book of Common Prayer. It was joyfully received by the reformers in that country; and in the bond signed by the *lords of the congregation*, it was resolved, "It is thought expedient, advised, and ordained, that in all parishes of this realm the Common Prayer be read weekly, on Sundays, and other festival-days, publicly in the parish churches, with the lessons from the Old and New Testaments, conformed to the order of the Book of Common Prayers."[k] This order was issued in the year 1557. Some writers have pretended that the English Liturgy was not intended, but that the bond referred to Knox's Liturgy. This position, however, cannot be maintained, since Knox's book was not yet known in Scotland. The truth is, that the Scottish reformers, so far from opposing the introduction of a liturgy, were glad to adopt that which had been used with such happy results in England. By the order, the lessons were to be read on festivals as well as on Sundays,

justification of their nonconformity. They argued that the book was not the same as that required by the act, because it differed from Edward's in more particulars than were specified; neither were the variations overlooked in the time of Elizabeth. The Puritans argued against Whitgift, "it is against the peace and furtherance of the gospel to make a schisme in commanding that which partly is absurd to doe or unlawful to be done, as to be bound to a fourme of prayer, taken from an unjust and uneven mould, in a time not so taught as could yeeld a perfect booke. The same also beying since altered, and this that is urged not the same that by law is authorised." Unlawful Practice of Prelates in Parte of a Register, 28 b.

[k] Knox, 110, 111; Keith, 66.

so that Knox's book could not have been intended, since it contains no mention of such lessons. The *Common Praires* are alluded to also in the *First Book of Discipline*, 1560.[l] "It hath been much controverted what is meant by this Book of Common Prayer; some persons strenuously affirming it to have been the Liturgy of the Church of England, and others as pertinaciously denying it. For my own part, I humbly think the affirmers need not to be very solicitous to gain their point. However, I must take notice that the first Liturgy printed at Geneva, 1558, with a preface dated the 10th of February, 1556-7, is commonly called the Book of Common Order, and sometimes that of Common Prayer; that in it there is no mention of lessons taken out of the Old and New Testaments. What weight these observations may have, joined to the publication of that book, which was posterior to this regulation in Scotland, I submit to the judgment of the reader."[m]

In the preface to the Liturgy of 1637, it is directly stated that the Anglican Liturgy had been used in Scotland at the beginning of the Reformation. Had the compilers of that book been mistaken, the error would have been pointed out by their adversaries. As, however, no such attempt was made, we may conclude that the assertion was true. In recent times all candid Scottish writers have admitted the fact. Thus, Dr. M'Crie,[n] after quoting a passage from a letter of Cecil to Throgmorton, in which it is said that the parish churches "have received the ser-

[l] Dunlop's Confessions, ii. 532, 536, 582. [m] Keith, 66.

[n] M'Crie's Knox, i. 424, 425. "That she might more cordially espouse their quarrel, they bound themselves by their subscription to embrace the Liturgy, with all the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, which for a time remained the only form of worship for the Kirk of Scotland." Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 127. The fact of the reading of the Book of Common Prayer in the parish churches of Scotland is stated in a letter of the time, now in the State-Paper Office. Sage asserted it in his Fundamental Charter of Presbytery; and succeeding researches have proved the correctness of his assertion. Sage's Works; Spottiswood Society, i. 81, 164. To talk, therefore, of the popery of the English Liturgy is to condemn the Scottish reformers, who gladly received it.

vice of the Church of England accordyng to King Edwarde's book," adds, "Another thing which inclines me to think that the English Liturgy was in the eye of those who made the agreement in 1557, is, that they mention the reading of the *lessones* of the New and Auld Testament *conforme* to the ordour of the Buik of Common Prayers." Dr. Cook is of the same opinion.[o] He says, indeed, that the matter is beyond a doubt. It was not until the year 1564 that the *Order of Geneva* was enjoined by an act of assembly to be used in Scotland; so that from 1557 to that time, a period of seven years, the Anglican Liturgy was adopted in the parish churches in that country. The Scottish people had no scruples on the subject; and many who were accustomed to visit England cheerfully joined in common prayer in our churches.

The next convocation of the province of Canterbury was assembled in the year 1562, and is one of the most important in our history. It was in this assembly that the Articles were revised and reduced into their present form and number. The convocation met January 12th; that of York also assembled at the same time. In the latter little business was transacted. In the province of Canterbury the archbishop stated, that an opportunity was now afforded of reforming things in the Church. They met sometimes in the chapter-house at St. Paul's, and at other times, by continuation, at Westminster, in Henry VII.'s chapel. On the second day of meeting, the archbishop came to St. Paul's, where, after the Litany in English, Day, provost of Eton, preached the opening sermon. The *first* Psalm was then sung in English, and the Bishop of London administered the communion to the archbishop and bishops.[p] The bishops and clergy then re-

[o] Cook's History of the Reformation in Scotland, i. 36.

[p] Parker drew up a Directory for the regulation of their proceedings. Strype's Parker, i. 238, 239; Syn. Ang. app.; Atterbury's Rights. In the Tenison Mss. we have a *Directory* for the first day of convocation. "A Di-

tired to the chapter-house, when they were addressed by the archbishop, who recommended Nowell to the lower house, by whom he was chosen to the office of prolocutor.[q]

But between the queen's accession and this convocation more than two years had elapsed; and as nothing could be set forth by due authority till it was settled by the synod, the archbishops and bishops of both provinces agreed upon *eleven Articles*, as a public profession of faith, which were to be subscribed by all the clergy, and read in their respective churches. The *first* article asserts the great doctrine of the *trinity in unity;* the *second*, a belief in the holy Scriptures, as containing all things necessary to salvation—it also comprehends the three creeds, as a summary of doctrine; the *third* relates to the Church, asserting that every national Church has power to ordain rites and ceremonies; the *fourth* excludes all who are not lawfully appointed from the ministry; the *fifth* asserts the supremacy; the *sixth*, that the Bishop of Rome has no more authority than other bishops; the *seventh* declares that the Book of Common Prayer is agreeable to Scripture, and it condemns the practice of praying in an unknown tongue; the *eighth* rejects the exorcism, oil, salt, and spittle, in baptism; the *ninth* and *tenth* refer to the *mass;* and the *eleventh* disallows of the use of images in churches. Of course these articles remained in force only until the Thirty-nine Articles were established by authority.[r]

rectorie for orders to be observed by my Lord of Canterbury his Grace the first day of the convocation. To St. Paul's. To put on their robes in the vestry. The ministers of the church to say the Litany, and afterwards *Veni Creator* in English. The preacher to preach in Latin. The archbishop to make an oration to the bishops and clergy. The archbishop sends the clergy to the accustomed place to choose a prolocutor." At the end of this volume, which contains many proceedings of convocation, is the following notice:

"Jul. 14, 1701. This book was collated from beginning to end with the original by us.

EDMUND GIBSON.
ROB. THOMPSON."

[q] Strype's Annals, I. i. 472, 473; Strype's Parker, i. 239, 241; Synod. Anglic. 198, 199; Wilkins, iv. 232; Tenison Mss. 751.

[r] Collier, ii. 463, 464; Strype's Annals, I. i. 223, 224; Burnet's Records;

The Articles of 1552 were submitted to the convocation, and some few alterations were made. In the third, the explanation of Christ's descent into hell was omitted; in that on the Scriptures, it was stated that some chapters were read from the Apocrypha, but not for the confirmation of doctrine. The names of the canonical books were also specified. The Article on the Lord's Supper was shortened and simplified, by a declaration that Christ's body is given and received after a spiritual manner; and those on the *souls deceased*, on the *millenarians*, and on the *salvation of all men* after a period of punishment, making the fortieth, forty-first, and forty-second of those of 1552, were omitted. When completed, the Articles were solemnly subscribed by both houses of convocation, as the *forty-two* had been in the time of King Edward.[s]

Wilkins, v. 195, 196. At a second session at Lambeth other articles were agreed upon. It was resolved that the preceding articles should be put in force, and that all the old service-books should be abolished and defaced in the visitations. It was ordered, that besides the Catechism for children, another should be devised for communicants; and a third, in Latin, for schools. As there was a want of clergymen, deprived priests were commanded to minister in cures, or be excommunicated. Another article relates to injunctions to be subscribed by such priests, who were to bind themselves not to preach, nor to administer the sacraments. Wilkins, iv. 224, 225. In 1561 a diocesan synod met at St. Asaph, in which the bishop enjoined the Catechism, in Welsh, to be read in churches every Sunday, and also in English. The clergy were ordered to study the Paraphrase of Erasmus. One of the rules was very singular, namely, that they should commit to memory the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans and the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Due reverence was ordered at the name of Jesus, "with lowliness of curtsey and extending of men's heads." From one of the rules it would seem that the Litany was said alone on Wednesdays and Fridays: "That the parsons, &c. do come together on Wednesdays and Fridays, being not holy-days, and there devoutly syng or sey the Litany, and exhort the people to hear the same, with other prayers, at hours and times convenient." In riding, the clergy are enjoined a short gown and a hat; in coming before the ordinary, a long gown and a square cap. The Epistle and Gospel were to be repeated in Welsh. Wilkins, iv. 228, 229.

[s] Burnet, vol. ii. 1, b. iii.; vol. iii. 1, b. vi.; Records, II. ii.; Fuller, ix. 72; Heylin's Eccles. Rest. appendix, 179-196; Collier, ii. 485; Strype's Annals, I. i. 485, 486. It was agreed to revise the articles, having first obtained the queen's permission. Heylin's Eccles. Res. part ii. 158, 159. The queen's

The Articles were accordingly published by authority, after they had been subscribed by both houses of convocation. They were also subscribed by the Archbishop of York, with his suffragans, on behalf of the province of York. This was by no means an uncommon practice in important matters. It was a joint agreement; a concurrence of both provinces. The province of York being small in comparison with Canterbury, and being also at a distance from the seat of government, the practice has usually been to agree to what was settled in the larger province. In such cases, the Archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans have generally consulted with the Archbishop of York before any important measures were transacted.[t] The Articles were, therefore, set forth by authority of the convocation in both provinces, that is, by a national council.

Several other matters were discussed in this convocation. Sandys, bishop of Worcester, introduced a paper, in which he proposed that the rubric in the baptismal service, authorising laymen to baptise in cases of necessity, should be altered, that the sign of the cross should be omitted, and that a scheme of discipline should be settled.[u] A paper was also subscribed by *thirty-three* members of

permission was obtained for a review. Ib. 333, 331. The consideration of the articles occupied several sessions; in the fourth the prolocutor proposed to the bishops that they should be adopted. The next day a long discussion took place, when the Catechism also was considered. The prolocutor requested that all might subscribe the articles, and an order to that effect was issued by the upper house. They were subscribed on the 29th of January. In the upper house no reluctance was evinced, but some of the lower house hesitated. The case was stated to the bishops by the prolocutor, who was requested to give in the names of the non-subscribers. Churton's Nowell, 95; Strype's Parker, i. 242. Syn. Ang. 194, by mistake for 202, 204, 206, 207.

[t] Wake's State, 376, 604; Strype's Annals, I. i. 487-492; Strype's Parker, i. 237; Burnet, vol. iii. 1, b. vi.; Atterbury, 379-381; Wilkins, iv. 232-238. The province of York met for a subsidy in 1561, and also in 1562. Wilkins, iv. 230, 243.

[u] Collier, ii. 485; Le Strange's Alliance, 241.

the lower house, in which they request that the Psalms in the Common Prayer should be sung by the whole congregation, or read entirely by the minister, and that musical performances and organs be dismissed; that lay baptism be not allowed; that the sign of the cross be omitted; that kneeling at the sacrament be left at the discretion of the ordinary; that copes and surplices be laid aside, and that the pulpit and desk be the same in form; that the clergy should not be compelled to wear particular gowns and caps; and that saints' days might be abrogated. Warm debates arose on these points among the clergy, some wishing to refer the questions to the upper house, others declaring against changes altogether. The Articles were rejected by the majority.[v] That the changes would have produced much confusion must be obvious. To instance one of their requests, namely, that kneeling at the sacrament should be left to the ordinary: in such a case, there would have been one practice in one diocese and another in the next adjoining, so that uniformity would have been impossible.

A paper was prepared to be presented to the synod containing the following notices:

"*First*, a Catechism is to be set forth in Latin, which is already done by Mr. Dean of St. Paul's, and wanteth only viewing.

"*Secondly*, certain Articles, containing the principal grounds of Christian religion, are to be set forth, much like to such Articles as were set forth a little before the death of King Edward. Of which Articles the most part may be used, with addition and correction, as shall be thought convenient.

"*Thirdly*, to these articles also may be adjoined the Apology (writ by Bishop Jewell) lately set forth, after it hath been once again revised, and so augmented or corrected as occasion serveth.

[v] Collier, ii. 486; Wilkins, iv. 239, 240; Strype's Annals, I. i. 499, 504. Nowell's name is among the subscribers.

"Then to be joined in one book, and by common consent to be authorised."

Nowell drew up the Catechism at the recommendation of Cecil, making considerable use of Ponet's, which had been set forth under King Edward. When approved by the lower house, it was sent up to the bishops, who gave their sanction. The book, however, was not published until 1570, when, at the request of the two archbishops, it was printed. It was reprinted in 1572 and in 1578, and translated into English by Norton in 1570. In the controversy with Martin Mar-Prelate, Bishop Cooper, in 1589, distinctly asserts that it was authorised by the Church of England.[x] "Now was finished that notable

[w] Strype's Annals, I. i. 473, 474, 522; Burnet, iii. 1, b. vi.; Wilkins, iv. 238-242.

[x] "For a Catechisme, I referre them to that which was made by the learned and godly man, M. Nowell, Deane of Paules, received and allowed by the Church of Englande." Cooper's Admonition to the People of England, &c. London, 1589, p. 66. Strype's Annals, 525-529; Strype's Parker, ii. 17; Synod. Anglic. 215; Collier, ii. 491. Collier remarks in his margin that the Synodus Anglicana only notices its being passed in the lower house. There can, however, be no doubt of the fact that it was sanctioned by both houses. Churton's Life of Nowell, 191, 192; Atterbury, 407-411. Nowell himself states it in his letter to Cecil, telling him that he had sent it, "not in his own name, as afore, but in the name of the clergy of the convocation, as their book; seeing it was by them approved and allowed." Strype's Annals, I. i. 526. Besides, it is confirmed by the canons in 1571 in the upper house. As, therefore, it was sanctioned by the lower house in 1562, and by the upper in 1571, it can scarcely be denied that it received the authority of convocation. It appears that on the 5th of February, Jewell and others were appointed to examine a catechism, which must have been Nowell's. In March the *Catechismus Puerorum* was presented to the bishops by the prolocutor, with the names of the clergy appended. Syn. Ang. 205, 206, 215; Wilkins, iv. 230, 238; Churton, 95, 96, 169. There is no evidence that the bishops actually sanctioned the larger catechism at this time; yet that it was generally approved by convocation is evident from the letter to Cecil. It was sent to the bishops with the sanction of the clergy, as "being by them remitted to the consideration of the lower house. They were advertised that the said house unanimously had approved thereof." Still the public confirmation by the bishops followed in 1571. Heylin's Eccles. Rest. part ii. 160; Churton, 172. But the canons of 1604 also confirm Nowell's Catechism. "All schoolmasters shall teach in English the larger

Catechism compiled by Alexander Nowell, the dean of St. Paul's, in elegant and pure Latin, which having been carefully examined, reviewed, and corrected by the bishops and clergy in the convocation last year, and subscribed by the lower house, was designed to be set forth as by them allowed and recommended as their own; and this not only for the standing use of the Church, but to put to silence its enemies abroad, who hitherto had objected to the Protestants here that nothing touching religion was with any authority or consent of any number of the learned here set forth."[z] A Shorter Catechism, being an abridgment of the former, was drawn up and published by the author for the use of schools, in the year 1570.[a]

Jewell's Apology was published in 1562, the same year in which the Articles were approved in convocation. It was set forth by authority of the queen, and also by the bishops. From what has been already stated, it is clear that Parker intended to comprise the *Articles*, the *Catechism*, and the *Apology* in one volume, to be put forth as the authorised documents of the Anglican Church.[b]

Though the question of discipline was discussed in this

or shorter catechism heretofore by publick authority set forth." Though we have no evidence of the actual sanction formally given by the upper house, yet the 74th canon, which states that it was set forth by authority, removes all doubt on the subject.

[z] Strype's Grindal, 138, 139.

[a] Strype's Parker, ii. 18. This is called the Middle Catechism. A third Catechism, called the Smaller Catechism, was also published by Nowell. This differs but slightly from that in the Book of Common Prayer. It is probable that Overall abridged the questions and answers on the sacraments from this catechism. Churton, 183-185.

[b] Jewell's Apology was usually regarded as the acknowledged confession of the Church of England. "The Apologie of the Church of England, which shortly after was set forth to the justifying of our doctrine, with the reasons of our mislike of poperie, hath ever since obtained principall commendations amongst all the Apologies and Confessions which hitherto have been set forth by any Church in Christendome." Bancroft's Sermon, 51. "For a sound and true confession, acknowledged by this our Church, I referre them to that notable Apologie of the English Church, by that Jewell of England, late bishop of Sarisburie." Cooper's Admonition, 66.

convocation, and certain measures were proposed by the lower house, yet no canons or regulations were enacted.[c]

With respect to the Homilies and their authority, it may be observed that their recognition is involved in subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. Both books are recognised: the *first* containing *twelve* Homilies, set forth in the time of Edward VI.; and the *second* containing *twenty-one*, published in the reign of Elizabeth. The *second* book was ready for publication when King Edward died, and was composed by the men who had drawn up the *first* book. In reply to the objection founded on the expression "*necessary for these times*," Fuller remarks—"I con-

[c] Strype's Annals, I. i. 508-512, 520, 521; Strype's Grindal, 100, 101; Burnet, iii. 1, b. vi.; Wake's State, 603. The convocation was prorogued April 14th, 1563. Strype's Parker, 244; Wilkins, iv. 240-242. The book of discipline was presented to the prolocutor Feb. 26th, and some other heads were added on the following day. Ib. 239. In the twentieth session "*Quendam librum de disciplina*" was presented, to which the lower house had unanimously agreed. The additions were proposed in the next session, and in the twenty-third it was returned to the bishops with the alterations. One of the additions is specified, "*De adulterio.*" Syn. Ang. 213-215. We hear nothing more of this book, consequently it was not passed by the convocation: neither can we ascertain its precise character. Heylin says that the project failed. Eccles. Rest. part ii. 160. Strype affirms that sixty-four names were appended to the paper; yet in the Acts it is stated to have been agreed to unanimously. Proposals for readers were also submitted to the convocation, though no synodical act was passed on the subject. Strype's Ann. I. i. 508-512, 514-516. Though the Book of Discipline is frequently mentioned in the Acts, yet probably we shall never discover a copy. Strype regrets the loss of the Acts of this convocation, alluding to a declaration of Burnet, &c. "A divine of great note, before a venerable auditory, had occasion once to say, that he had once in his hand an original journal of the lower house." Ann. I. i. 471. The passage to which Strype refers occurs in Burnet's sermon before the House of Commons, January 31st, 1688-89. "I have had in my hands the original journal of the lower house of convocation, in the fifth year of that glorious reign in which the matter of the ceremonies was first argued; and when it came to the vote, it was carried by the greater number of the voices of the members that were present to lay down all those subjects of contests; but the proxies turned it to the severer side." Sermon ii. 15. In the same sermon he states, that the hopes of the Papists "were spoiled by Mary's persecutions," and that they saw no prospect of recovering their ground except by creating divisions among Protestants.

fess what is necessary in one age may be less needful in another; but what in one age is *godly and wholesome doctrine* cannot in another be ungodly and unhealthful: as if our faith did follow *fashions*, and *truth* alter with the *times;* like Ahitophel his counsel, though good in itself, yet not at some seasons."[d] The book was printed in 1563. Prefixed to the second book is an *admonition* relative to the *lessons* to be read in the church; "and where it may so chance some one or other chapter of the Old Testament to fall in order to be read upon the Sundays or holydays, which were better to be changed with some other of the New Testament of more edification, it shall be well done to spend your time to consider well of such chapters beforehand."

It has been argued from this clause, that a discretionary power is vested in the clergy to change the lessons at pleasure. A few remarks, therefore, may be offered on this point.

In King Edward's Liturgies there were no proper lessons for Sundays; but the chapters were read in succession, as is still the case in our daily services. It is clear that the *admonition* was written before the publication of the book in 1563, when proper lessons for Sundays and holydays had not been fixed. In the Book of Common Prayer, as revised under Queen Elizabeth, proper lessons are appointed; and as the book was established by parliament, the lessons were sanctioned by the same authority; consequently, even at that time, no clergyman could take upon himself to change them, because the act of parliament was of greater obligation than the admonition. The admonition was intended to grant a liberty to the clergy after the queen's accession, before proper lessons were appointed; and it is singular that it was not suppressed when the defect was supplied. It is ordered by the Act of Uniformity, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, that the Book of Common Prayer was to be used "in such order and form

[d] Fuller, ix. 75.

as is mentioned in the said book, so authorised by parliament in the said fifth and sixth year of the reign of King Edward VI.; with one alteration or addition, of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year." The *admonition* could not be pleaded against the *act*. The very words of the admonition, "where it may so chance some one or other chapter of the Old Testament to fall," prove that it refers to the period before the act, when the chapters were taken in order. They could not refer to the period subsequent to the act, when lessons were fixed for Sundays, and therefore could not be said to *chance to fall*.[e]

But the case is still clearer since the last Act of Uniformity. The Calendar and Tables of Lessons are a part of the Book of Common Prayer; consequently they are enjoined by act of parliament; and no royal injunction, even were it to be issued now, could overturn an act of parliament. It seems strange, therefore, that clergymen should plead the admonition; and it is clear that the men who do so are unacquainted with the whole question. The following *rubrical* directions occur in "*the order how the rest of holy Scripture is appointed to be read*," namely, "*The Old Testament is appointed for the first lessons at morning and evening prayer. The New Testament is appointed for the second lessons at morning and evening prayer.*" Now the *admonition* did not, even when it was in force, authorise the substitution of one chapter of the *Old Testament* for another, but the substitution of one from the *New Testament* for one from the *Old;* so that the parties who plead the admonition violate their own

[e] Strype observes, "By which passage it may seem that this admonition, and consequently the whole second book, was wrote and finished before the queen's first parliament, for in the Act of Uniformity then made this was then provided for; and the alteration of the lessons for the Sundays, as it was in the old Common Prayer-Book, is taken notice of in that act, as one of the alterations confirmed by that act; so that I wonder that clause was not left out of the admonition, printed after the Sunday lessons were corrected." Strype's Annals, I. ii. 105; Wilkins, iv. 223, 224.

principle, unless they read a chapter from the *New Testament*, and in such cases two chapters from the *New* would be read.[e]

Archbishop Parker commenced a metropolitan visitation in the year 1560, which continued through the years 1561 and 1562, during which the bishops of his province were inhibited from holding their usual assemblies of the clergy. In the year 1563 he visited his own diocese in person, the previous visitations having been executed by commission; and the Articles which were used on that occasion were published by the archbishop. Strype mentions his going down to his diocese this year; but he takes no notice of any Articles of Visitation.[f] Neither are any to be found in Parker's Register. A few years since I met with the copy which I now possess, in a volume of tracts. No notice of the existence of any such production by historians or bibliographers has yet been discovered. We have, therefore, the fact of the existence of the most important Visitation Articles in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and yet the register and all our writers are totally silent on the subject. Historically the importance of these articles is very great, since they relate to a period respecting which our information is still but scanty. There is an inquiry respecting the use of the surplice, which, though it occurs in those of 1567, is not found in the record of those of 1560; and the circumstance shews that the pro-

[e] The Puritans were too honest to shelter themselves under the admonition in the Homilies. "Neither mattens nor even song can be sung or said without the chapters be read; and as for the preface to the Homilies, what doth that help the falsification of the parliamentary booke, when the same, in the place of six and twenty of canonical hath appointed so many of apocryphal matters upon feast daies to be read? Or how can the preface exempt a minister from being punishable before the king's justices, if he shall follow some private preface and break the king's public edict?" Such was the view of the Puritans. They could not plead the authority of the preface in their day; yet since the last Act of Uniformity, by which the calendar is confirmed as part of the Book of Common Prayer, all possible pretences are removed. Certaine Considerations, &c., 1605, p. 14.

Strype's Parker, i. 253, 254.

gress of puritanism compelled the archbishop to proceed with more strictness in the matter of conformity. It is stated that the Homilies, which had been lying before the queen a long time, were now published, in order that copies might be supplied to the clergy in his visitation. It is probable, therefore, that copies were left in the various parishes with these Articles. The archbishop went down to his diocese for his visitation soon after Midsummer; and these articles prove, that the Homilies were then printed; for they are mentioned with the Bible and the Paraphrase of Erasmus, and ordered to be placed in churches.[g]

During several years the convocation merely met and was prorogued. In 1566, however, the convocation of both provinces assembled, though little if any business of an ecclesiastical character was transacted. They were assembled chiefly for the purpose of granting subsidies to the crown.[h]

The next important meeting of convocation occurred in 1571. The sermon was preached by Whitgift; and Aylmer, then Archdeacon of Lincoln, was chosen prolocutor of the lower house. At the *third* session it was observed that the Bishop of Gloucester had not appeared. After due summons, therefore, the sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him by the archbishop. It was strongly suspected that he was inclined to popery, or that he was unwilling to subscribe the Articles. At the next session the sentence was ordered to be made

[g] Articles to be inquired of in the visitation of the Moste Reverend Father in God, Matthew, by the sufferaunce of God, Archebyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane, in the yeare of our Lorde God M.D.LXIII. M.A. Imprinted at London by Reginalde Wolfe, Anno Domini M.D.LXIII. The Colophon: Imprinted at London by Reginalde Wolfe, Anno Domini M.D.LXIII.

[h] Wake's State, 502. Both convocations met in 1563, and were prorogued to 1564, then to 1565. In 1566 both met and granted a subsidy. Wilkins, iv. 243, 246, 251. The advertisements were issued in 1564. Wilkins, iv. 247-250. My copy of the advertisements has various marginal notes by Cole the antiquary.

public in the cathedral at Gloucester. The bishop afterwards submitted, when the sentence was removed. In this assembly the Thirty-nine Articles were read, and again solemnly confirmed and subscribed by both houses. It was ordered that the Book of Articles should be reprinted, under the direction of Jewell, bishop of Sarum; and that every bishop should take a sufficient number of copies for the supply of the clergy, to whom they were to be delivered at visitations or diocesan synods. Further, it was ordered, that the Articles should be read four times every year in every parish, and that in future no one should be admitted to holy orders until he had solemnly subscribed them. It was ordered also that all the members of the lower house, who had not previously subscribed, should subscribe on this occasion.[1]

The Articles were now published in Latin and English, as they had been in 1563. Subscription was pressed with more rigour than during the previous years. By the canons passed in this convocation, which will be noticed presently, the bishops were ordered to demand the licenses of the clergy, and not to restore them until subscription to the Articles had been enforced. This measure was offensive to some of the clergy, whose views were opposed to full conformity; and the year 1571 is by some writers termed the *woful year of subscription*. From that period the Articles have been subscribed by all clergymen at ordination, on being licensed to a cure, and at institution to a benefice.

The succession of our bishops is a question into which I shall not enter at length; I will merely observe, that bishops have always existed in England. In every age they were the governors of the Church; and from the present time up to the introduction of Christianity, the succession can be traced with as much accuracy as the line of our kings. Some persons allege against what is termed the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, that we receive it

[1] Wake's State, 604; Strype's Parker, ii. 51, 53; Collier, ii. 530; Wilkins, iv. 260, 261; Heylin's Presbyterians, 267.

from Rome, and that it depends on the succession of the popes. But we have nothing to do with Rome in the matter. Nor does it concern us to establish what may be termed a personal succession. In many countries it is not easy to trace the line of kings, though it is known that they were governed by kings. We know that bishops have always ordained presbyters; and this fact is sufficient, even though the names of all the archbishops and bishops in early times may not be preserved. The succession, as held by the Anglican Church, is explained in the *preface* to the Ordination Service: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church,—bishops, priests, and deacons."[j] This point is so clear, that candid writers among the presbyterians, such as Calvin, Beza, Baxter, and others, have admitted it. The Church of England declares that bishops, priests, and deacons have always existed in the Church. This is the *apostolical succession;* for the apostles appointed bishops, who again appointed others, from whom the order has been continued to the present time; and it is no argument against the doctrine to allege that in early times the names of individual bishops cannot be ascertained.

Into the Romish *fable* of the *Nag's-Head ordination* I need not enter, since no respectable author has ever given any credit to the statement.[k]

[j] It cannot be fairly argued that our ordination preface does not pledge the clergy to the maintenance of the opinion that three orders of ministers have always existed, and that, by consequence, a Church cannot be duly constituted without them. Whether such be the fact or not, the Church of England maintains it; so that if a person hold the negative, he cannot honestly subscribe to our formularies. The Puritans, seeing this consequence, affirmed that the assertion was a manifest untruth. In a list of such alleged untruths they class the assertion of these orders in the ministry. "It affirmeth that it is evident," &c. The London petition in Survey of Book of Common Prayer. They did not believe that the words were capable of any other construction.

[k] Mason's Vindication, by Lindsay, 1728; Bramhall's Consecration and

The clause, "*The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith,*" in the 20th article, gave rise to a controversy which requires some notice. In the year 1637, Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne were censured in the Star-Chamber for their attacks upon the Church of England. Among other things, it was alleged against Laud, that he had inserted the clause in the recent editions without any authority. This led to an examination of the subject, the result of which was stated by the archbishop in his speech at the sentence of the three individuals. Laud even charged the Puritans with *razing* out the clause; and certainly there was more reason for such a conclusion than that he had inserted it surreptitiously. In a speech delivered at the time, he remarks: "But for the articles made in the queen's time, and now in force, that this clause should not be found in English or Latin copies till the year 1628, that it was set forth with the king's declaration before it, is to me a miracle; but your lordships shall see the falsehood and boldness of these men.

"What! is this affirmative clause in no copy, English or Latin, till the year 1628? Strange! why, my lords, I have a copy of the Articles in English of the year 1612, and of the year 1605, and of the year 1593, and in Latin of the year 1563, which was one of the first printed copies, if not the first of all; and in all these this affirmative clause for the Church's power is in."[1]

There is a manuscript copy of the Articles in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, with the signatures of Parker and several bishops,—the very copy used in con-

Succession of Protestant Bishops vindicated, and the infamous Fable of the Nag's Head clearly confuted, 8vo; Courayer's Defence of the Validity of the English Ordinations, and Defence of the Dissertation, 3 vols. 1728; Williams's Succession of Protestant Bishops asserted, 8vo; Brown's Concio ad Clerum, 4to, 1688: in this work the Record is most beautifully printed from the MS.

[1] Laud's Speech in the Star-Chamber, the 12th of June, 1637. London, 4to, 1637, pp. 67, 68.

vocation, and bequeathed by Archbishop Parker to this college.[m] In this copy the clause is wanting; but the absence proves nothing, one way or the other; for it was never duly sanctioned by the crown, and was probably nothing more than a draft or sketch, to be altered or amended as circumstances might require. Strype remarks, that it cannot be a record, since so many strokes of Parker's red-lead pencil appear upon it.[n] The arch-

[m] It would seem that Parker kept it because it was not a record, bequeathing it to his college at his death. The copy actually made, the record was lodged in the Register's Court. It seems strange that Dr. Lamb and others should argue for the authority of the Cambridge Ms., when the subscription is so guarded in the document itself as to prove that the Articles were not confirmed. "Ista subscriptio facta est sub hac protestatione, quod nihil statuunt in præjudicium cujusque senatusconsult. sed tantum supplicem libellum petitiones suas continentem humiliter offerunt" Lamb's Historical Account. The very subscription proves that the book was not established. Wake supposes that they had proceeded thus far without the queen's license, having acted on her permission, conveyed through the archbishop; and that therefore they were doubtful how far they could subscribe to what they had agreed upon. He thinks that the statute referred to was the 25th Henry VIII., and that the form was added as a security. Wake's State, 602, 603. Strype says: "After these names, &c. were these words, cautiously written for fear (as it seems) of a præmunire." An. I. i. 490; Strype's Parker, ii. 53-56. The Cambridge Ms., which was engrossed as the act of convocation, did not agree with the authorised copy in the public register; neither did Wolfe print from the Ms., as is manifest from the errors of his autograph given in his margin. Ridley's Third Letter, 127. The important fact that the copy of the Articles which was sanctioned by convocation, ratified by the crown, and consequently duly authorised, was in the proper office open to all the world, and contained the affirmative clause, is conclusive against all possible objections.

[n] Strype's Parker, ii. 55. The clause is found in editions of 1563, 1571, 1581, 1586, 1590, 1593, 1605, 1612, 1624, and 1628. After the last year it appears never to have been omitted. Laud was not aware of the existence of several of these editions. Of that of 1590 I know of no copy except my own; nor have I found it cited in this controversy. Bedford in his Vindication states that he had three printed copies of an English edition of 1571, with the clause. Preface, pp. 54, 141-143. In a copy of the Articles in Laud's possession, he mentions in writing: "The words are in the original copy of the Articles." Bedford, 36. This copy was in existence when Bedford wrote. The fact was communicated to him by Hooper, Bishop of Bath and Wells. The original record was destroyed in the fire of 1666, but the

bishop usually marked the books which he read with a red-lead pencil.[o] It seems, therefore, certain that the manuscripts at Cambridge were the copies used in the convocation, which were subscribed by the members of both houses; but that they were of no authority, inasmuch as the final corrections were not made, and the official copy, which was destroyed in the Fire of London, actually contained the disputed clause. This fact is decisive of the whole question; and that such was the fact it is not possible to deny. Laud says: "But, my lords, I shall make it plainer yet; for 'tis not fit, concerning an article of religion, and an article of such consequence for the order, truth, and peace of this Church, you should rely upon my copies, be they never so many, or never so ancient. Therefore I sent to the public records in my office; and here, under my officer's hand, who is a public notary, is returned me the twentieth article, with this affirmative clause in it; and there is also the whole body of the Articles to be seen." This very document, which was submitted to the lords, signed by the notary, was in existence in 1715, when Bennet published his valuable *Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles*.[p] This fact is conclusive.

evidence is overwhelming. The clause is retained in an edition of 1642. It is singular that an edition should have been published at that time; but though the title-page states that it was *printed for the benefit of the commonwealth*, yet it is probable that it was put forth by the friends of the king.

[o] Strype's Annals, I. i. 485; Bennet's Essay, pp. 176-211; A Vindication of the Church of England from the Aspersion of a late Libel, intituled *Priestcraft in Perfection*, &c. pp. 74-128; Lamb's Historical Account, 12-24.

[p] It was then in the possession of Colonel Hale of Cottrells, in the county of Wilts, the grandson of Sir Matthew Hale. Bennet's Essay, 166. "The Articles are taken from the printed edition put forth with the royal authority in 1563, in preference to the original Ms., which is still extant, but was evidently corrected before the articles were ratified by the queen." "The printed copy is the earliest known record which can be shewn to have obtained full synodical authority." The Ms. copy was not binding because it was not ratified. "Though attested by the suffrages of both houses of convocation, it is of no real authority. It has no token of having received the ratification of the crown." Cardwell's Synodalia, preface, xxvii. xxviii. p. 38.

The records were open to all persons; and had there been an error, it would have been detected by the archbishop's enemies. It is true that those records were destroyed in 1666; but it is also true, that they were open to public inspection until that time; so that it is not possible to suppose that the clause was not in the authentic copy signed by the two houses and sanctioned by the crown. In 1563 the Articles were published in Latin by Wolf, and with the royal authority; and this edition has the disputed clause. Its omission in various subsequent editions may easily be explained. The clause was not forged in order to curb the Puritans; but it was probably omitted in the first instance under the influence of persons who were friendly to their views: at all events, it is certain that the clause formed a part of the article in its original state. Heylin observes: "Thus much I can say of mine own knowledge, that having occasion to consult the records of convocation, I found this controverted clause, *verbatim*, in these following words, *Habet Ecclesia ritus statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis authoritatem.*"[q]

[q] Heylin's Examen Historicum, pp. 144, 145; Life of Laud, 20, 21; Bennet's Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles, 1715; Bedford's Vindication of the Church of England, 1710; Collier has given an abstract of Bedford's Work, vol. ii. 486-490; Strype's Annals, I. i. 485; Strype's Parker, ii. 54-57; Fuller, ix. 73, 74; Cardwell's Synodalia, i. 34-41. Heylin expresses his surprise at Fuller's doubts, when he had access to the records in which the clause existed in the copy which was ratified. Examen, 145. Pearson's No Necessity of Reformation, 25, 26. Fuller, however, states that the clause was in "the original of the articles, 1562-3, as appeareth under the hand of a notary, whose inspection and attestation is only decisive in this case." Book ix. 74. In 1637 an anonymous reply to Laud's speech was published; and the writer has the hardihood, notwithstanding Laud's assertion about editions, to assert that he may have caused "to be printed, or sett under his hand, copies of what tenor and date he pleaseth to command." Divine and Politike Observations, newly translated out of the Dutch language, wherein they were lately divulged, upon those lines in the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, pronounced in the Starre Chamber upon the 14th of June, 1637, &c.: printed in the yeare of our Lord 1637, 4to, pp. 53, 54. The allusion to the Dutch language is a mere trick. The Presbyterians, subsequent to the Restoration, objected that the Articles were not confirmed in parliament in

Besides the ratification of the Articles, a book of Canons was also arranged and settled by this convocation, under the following title: *Liber quorundam Canonum Disciplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.* The book was duly authorised by the upper house, but, from some unexplained cause, it was

1571, because they were not recited in the Act, the title only being given. Pearson replies, that they are called in the Act, the Confession of Faith, to which subscription was required, and not to the title. Pearson's No Necessity of Reformation, &c. pp. 22-24. It is quite amusing to find the Puritans of different ages or periods shifting their grounds of objection to the Church. This question of the clause in the twentieth article was raised by Heylin, on proceeding to take his degree of D.D. Among other questions, he proposed to give an answer to this, "Whether the Church hath authority," &c. Prideaux, the divinity professor, replied that he had falsified the article, reading it from an edition which did not contain the clause. Heylin, remarking the size of the volume in the hands of Prideaux, knew that he had read the article from the *Corpus Confessionum*, published at Geneva in 1612. To this book he objected, and sent to a neighbouring bookseller's, and procured an English edition containing the clause. Vernon's Life of Heylin, 59-61; Barnard's Life of Heylin, 151-154. But as early as 1561 some of the clergy objected to this clause; a fact which proves its existence. "Many there were who boggled at it," alluding to the twentieth article. "Some stumbled at it in regard of the first clause added to the twentieth article about the authority of the Church." Heylin's Eccles. Rest. ii. 165. The controversy, as we have seen, was kept alive by the Puritans in Laud's time; and it was revived in the last century by the author of a work, *Priestcraft in Perfection.* This work led to another examination of the whole question. No stronger evidence could be given of a bad cause than Collins's assertion, that all editions with the clause previous to 1593 are forgeries. "I am persuaded that the English copies of the Articles which have the clause, pretended to be printed in 1571, are copies forged, at least, since Laud and Heylin's assertion of there being no such copies, and perhaps very lately forged." Collins's Essay, 252-257. Yet Laud never said that there were no such copies, but merely that he had not seen any. This proves, at least, that the subject had not greatly attracted his attention. The fact is, that other copies in English with the clause, besides these of 1571, existed. There is an edition of 1586 in English containing the clause, and one of the year 1590, in which it appears, yet neither was known to Laud. But Collins's theory is an outrage to common sense; for he tries to prove that the copies of 1571, with the clause, are made up by the insertion of a part of a sheet of a later edition. Such a strange assertion proves that Collins had no knowledge of books. In 1617 Mocket published his work *De Politia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, containing the Liturgy, the Articles, Jewell's Apology, and Nowell's Catechism in Latin. In the twentieth article he omitted the clause, probably from printing from the Geneva edition

not submitted to the lower, though there can be no doubt that it would have been sanctioned by that assembly. These canons were followed by the bishops in the management of their dioceses; nor was any objection raised on the ground of want of authority. The queen, it seems, considered that the authority of the bishops was sufficient, or that the lower house was included in the decisions of the upper.[r] Under the head *De Concionatoribus* we have a proof of the regard paid by the Anglican Church to the ancient fathers. It is ordered, that preachers "should not teach any thing as matter of faith, religiously to be observed, but that which is agreeable to the Old and New Testament: or collected out of the same doctrine by

The book was condemned and ordered to be burned, chiefly, as Heylin supposes, on account of this omission. Fuller, in mentioning the circumstance, expresses his belief that the publication without the royal permission was the cause. Heylin's Laud, 75, 76; ib. Examen, 186, 187; Fuller, x. 72; Atterbury, 173.

[r] Strype's Parker, ii. 59, 60. In consequence of Heylin's proceedings in Oxford, Prideaux ordered an edition to be printed at the University Press, that he might have a copy after his own fashion. Before the book was actually published, but after it was printed, Laud ascertained that the clause was omitted, and he immediately ordered the leaf to be cancelled. This was done in most of the copies. In my own copy the leaf is inserted. The author of the Confessional stated that he had a copy with the uncancelled leaf. Heylin remarks, that Prideaux printed from the edition of 1571, or from the *Corpus Confessionum;* but it is evident that he took the edition of 1571, since the *Liber Quorundam*, &c. is printed with the Articles, to which it originally belonged. Heylin's Examen, app.; Heylin's Presbyterians, 268; the Confessional, 331; Ridley's Third Letter to the Author of the Confessional, 131. The fact that the canons were originally printed with the Articles is evident; for all the copies have the signatures continued from the Articles. I have two editions of the year 1571 differing in various particulars, and also two of the year 1575; but in every case the Canons are appended, and form a part of the book, the signature of the first sheet of the canons coming in order after the last of the Articles. The Oxford edition of 1636 also has the Canons appended in the same way; and this circumstance proves that it was printed from an edition of 1571, since they do not occur in the Corpus Confessionum. It may therefore be remarked, that whenever the Canons occur in a separate form, they are an imperfect book, inasmuch as they constitute with the Articles but one volume. The form of the title to the Canons indicates that they are only a portion of a book.

the ancient fathers and catholic bishops of the Church."[s] These canons were also subscribed and approved by Grindal, archbishop of York, and his suffragans.[t]

By these canons the *Martyrology* of John Foxe was authorised as a public work. It was ordered to be placed in the halls of bishops, in cathedral churches, and in the houses of the archdeacons. In the case of bishops, it is specified, that the book should be for the use of the servants and guests. Collier mentions the circumstance, but remarks, that we are not to infer from such an order that the convocation believed all the matters of fact reported in the history.[u] It is evident, however, that the convocation placed a higher value on the work than Collier did; and that though they might not feel called upon to decide upon every fact, they regarded it as a true history of the Church, or they would not have sanctioned it by such a solemn decision. Under the head *Ludimagistri* we have the following clause: "Nec alium Latinum catechismum quam qui editus anno 1570, quem etiam Anglice redditum, pueros, qui Latine nesciunt, docere volumus;" which evidently refers to Nowell's Catechism.

Some few matters were transacted in parliament this year, which, as bearing on our subject, require notice.

[s] Sparrow's Collections; Strype's Annals, II. i. 107; also dedication to Jewell's Works, 1611; Wake's State, 605; Heylin's Tracts, 19.

[t] Strype's Parker, ii. 57-62.

[u] Collier, ii. 531; Heylin's Tracts, 613; Wilkins, iv. 263-269. The Bible, in the largest volume lately printed in London, was ordered also to be placed in the house of every archbishop and bishop. This was done, says Heylin, "to keep up the reputation of the authorised Bible, whose credit was much decreased by those of the Genevian faction to advance their own." Heylin's Hist. Presb. 269. Of Foxe, Heylin says, "There was nothing aimed at, but to give credit to the book, which served so seasonably to create an odium in all sorts of people against the tyrannies and superstitions of the Pope of Rome. No purpose either in the bishops or clergie to justifie all, or any of the passages in the same contained, which have since been made use of by the disciplinarians, either to countenance some strange doctrine, or decry some ceremony, to which he shewed himself a friend or enemy, as the case might vary." Hist. Presb. 269.

It will be remembered that Henry VIII. was authorised to appoint a committee of thirty-two persons to reform the ecclesiastical law. These persons, as was noticed in a previous chapter, were to have power to meet from time to time; but until that work should be completed, the canons in use, which were not contrary to the laws or the prerogative, were to remain in force.[v] In the reign of Edward VI., the work known under the title *Reformatio Legum* was drawn up by Cranmer, Goodrich, Cox, May, Peter Martyr, Rowland Taylor, and others. These laws were translated into Latin by Haddon and Cheke. The death of Edward put an end to the attempt; and the book remained in manuscript until the year 1571, when it was printed by Day, with a preface by John Foxe, the martyrologist.[w] It was the object of the original compilers to procure its confirmation by parliament, as a code of ecclesiastical laws, to the supercession of all the old canons. The work was completed, and nothing was wanted but the royal confirmation, as appears from the Act of Confirmation which is prefixed to the book. The clergy complained that some of the old canons were injurious to the prerogative and burdensome to the people. They prayed, therefore, that an examination should be made; and, in consequence of their petition, the work was undertaken. The subject was at this time brought before parliament; but as the scheme was discouraged by the crown, the attempt to get the book authorised completely failed. It was reprinted in 1640; but as no attempt has since been made to reform the canon law, the canons remain in the state in which they were left by the Act of Submission.[x]

[v] Gibson's Codex, 975.

[w] Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum ex authoritate primum Regis Henrici 8 inchoata: deinde per Regem Edouardem 6 provecta audactaq. in hunc modum atq. nunc ad pleniorem ipsarum reformationem in lucem edita. Londini, 1571, 4to: it has been recently reprinted at Oxford. Gibson's Codex, 952.

[x] Strype's Parker, ii. 62, 63; Strype's Annals, II. i. 96, 97; Collier, ii. 326. The convocation of York met in 1571 for a subsidy. Wilkins, iv. 270.

The next year the convocation met in both provinces. In that of York nothing of any importance was transacted, while very little was effected in that of Canterbury. In the latter, the archbishop's speech at the opening of the convocation is extant. Whitgift was chosen to fill the office of prolocutor of the lower house. Various prorogations took place till the year 1575, when several important subjects were introduced.[y] It was opened under the presidency of the Bishop of London, the see of Canterbury being vacant; but Grindal was soon after translated from York, when he presided in the convocation. A Book of Articles was framed and subscribed by both houses, and then published by royal authority. Several of them are still regarded in the regulation of the affairs of the Church, being embodied in the canons of 1604. Testimonials prior to ordination were required, and the candidates were to be able to give an account of their faith in Latin. It was also enacted, that no one should be admitted to the order of deacon until he had attained the age of twenty-three, nor to that of priest before the age of twenty-four. Bishops were not to be at liberty to ordain persons from other dioceses without letters dismissory from the bishops of those sees. The bishops were instructed to see that the Church Catechism was diligently taught in every parish. An article was passed on the subject of private baptism; but when the whole were published by the queen's authority, it was omitted. It had been the practice to allow lay baptism in cases of necessity; but the convocation decided, though the article was suppressed, that it should be administered by a lawful minister. This fact, therefore, is an evidence of the sense of the Anglican Church at that time. Still, as the article was not published, the matter

[y] Wake's State, 503, 605; Strype's Parker, ii. 207-211; Strype's Whitgift, i. 46, 47; Collier, i. 46, 47; Wilkins, iv. 270, 273, 279-281, 283. These Articles of 1575 are given by Wilkins. The last was struck out by the queen, who disliked it, and is not given in the printed copy. It allowed of marriage at all times of the year. Wake's State, app. 230-232; Heylin's Hist. Presb. 283.

remained in the same state until the commencement of the reign of James I., when certain alterations were made in the Book of Common Prayer.[z] Whitgift, however, and several other individuals, defended the practice in cases of necessity, but in no other. They supposed that if the essentials were preserved, the baptism was valid, even though performed by a layman, or even a midwife, provided the necessity was clear.[a]

[z] Strype's Annals, II. i. 533; Strype's Grindal, 289, 290, 537-541; Collier, ii. 551, 552; Wake's State, 606; app. 230-232; Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i. 132-138; Heylin's Hist. of Presbyterians, p. 245; Gibson's Codex, 446, 447; Wilkins, iv. 284, 285; Heylin's Laud, 27.

[a] Strype's Whitgift, iii. 139. This question of lay baptism was frequently discussed. The Puritans always objected to it, probably because it was allowed in the Church of Rome. In 1573 Dering says, "There is an order how women may baptise. All reformed Churches have condemned it; and how can I allow it?" Parte of a Register, 83. Crane, another Puritan, says, "It is allowed by the book to others than ministers to baptise in the time of necessity as they call it, which is unlawful for anie but for the minister to doe." Ib. 122. The authors of the *Christian Letter*, against Hooker, assert that the fathers of the English Church deny that the Book of Common Prayer authorised baptism by women. Covel, in replying to this letter, argues that, in cases of necessity, baptism by women is lawful. Covel's Just and Temperate Defence of the Five Books of Ecclesiastical Politie, 1603, p. 91. Archbishop Hutton says, "I heard divers reverend fathers, who were learned preachers in King Edward's days, and very privy to the doings in the convocation, and themselves dealers in anno primo Elizabethæ, affirm plainly that there was no meaning to allow that midwives and women should baptise, no more than to minister the supper of the Lord to the sick in private houses; but would not lay it down in plain words, lest it might hinder the passage in the parliament." Strype's Whitgift, iii. 398, 399. From this note it will appear that some of the Puritans denied that the Book of Common Prayer allowed of lay baptism; while others denounced the book for authorising the practice. Some curious particulars relative to the objections of the Puritans to the Book of Common Prayer will be given in a subsequent chapter; but it may be remarked here, that throughout the reign of Elizabeth they were constantly complaining of the practice of lay baptism, some of them contending at the same time that it was not authorised by the Church of England. "Our Church saieth that it is not lawfull to administer the sacraments without that calling; and that God and well-ordered Churches forbidd women to baptize: you (as we think) contrarie to our Church, maintaine such Churches as allow the private baptisme by women in case of necessitie." A Christian Letter of certaine English Protestants, unfeigned favourers to the present state of Religion, &c., unto that reverend and learned man, Mr. R. Hoo, requiring resolution in certaine mat-

In the admonition to the parliament, among the objections to the Book of Common Prayer, baptism by women is specified. Sometimes it was alleged that the practice was enjoined, at others that it was disallowed by the book; though generally the Puritans concurred with Cartwright. Whitgift replies: "I deny baptising by women to be expressed in that booke; and when you have proved it to be necessarily gathered out of the same, then you shall have my judgment of the same."[b] Cartwright soon published a reply.[c] There are some particulars connected with the first edition of Cartwright's *Replye* which merit special notice. In the copies of the first edition the errors are corrected with a pen through a considerable portion of the work, and probably by Cartwright himself.

On this point the evidence appears at least very strong, if not conclusive. At the end of the address to the Church,

ters of doctrine, &c. 1599, pp. 24, 25. The book was privately printed by the Puritans. In 1588, in a meeting in Warwickshire, the Puritans decided that such baptism was unlawful. Bancroft's Dangerous Positions, &c. p. 89. In another privately printed book in this reign they ask, "whether a preacher onely upon occasion of his text, teaching the people that women by the law of God may not baptise, may be justly condemned to have preached maliciously against the Book of Common Prayer, the said preacher not once mentioning one word of the said booke." An Abstract of certain Canons, Constitutions, &c. 4to, p. 264. This book is without date, nor is there any name of printer or place.

[b] Whitgift's Answere to a certain Libel, intituled An Admonition to the Parliament: London, 1572, 4to, pp. 79, 80. The Admonition is a small unpaged volume, printed on the continent, but without any name of the printer or the place. Whitgift gives the whole in his Answere.

[c] A Replye to an Answere made of M. Doctor Whitgift agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament, by T. C. It is undated, yet it must have been printed in 1573, since Whitgift's Defence of the Answere appeared in 1574. Copies of the first edition are very rare. Herbert had never seen one. A second edition, also without date, appeared within a few years. Cartwright soon published another work. The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: against Maister Doctor Whitgift's Second Answer, touching the Church Discipline. Imprinted 1575, 4to. Two years later another work appeared. The Rest of the Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: against Maister Doctor Whitgift's Second Answer, touching the Church Discipline. Imprinted 1577.

in this edition, there is a notice, "The Printer to the Reader." In the first place, he laments his poverty, by which he was prevented from having different sorts of letters. Then he states that he had not been trained to the art, and that consequently "divers quotations" were "misplaced," and "some other faults in the text" were committed. Yet he pleads for his errors, that he "wanted the commoditie that other prynters commonly have, of beeing neare eyther unto the author or to some that is made privy unto hys booke. Whych maye the better appeare, for that after the author came unto me, whych was when the halfe of the booke was printed, the faultes neither are so many nor so great as before." He then adds: "I have procured the groser faultes, and those wherein there is any daunger of misleading the reader, to be amended with the penne." After this we have still a list of errata: "Faultes escaped in this booke, besydes those whych are amended wyth the pen." As Cartwright was with the printer when the work was half finished, while he had complained that no friend of the author's had been near, it seems almost certain that the notes are in the actual writing of the author.

Two editions also of Whitgift's *Defence* were published in the same year, corresponding exactly in pagination, signatures, and catch-words. The first edition, however, has a list of errata, which are corrected in the second.[d]

Whitgift's *Answer* and *Defence*, with Cartwright's *Replies*, are of exceeding importance, since they embrace that controversy which issued in the temporary success of Puritanism and the depression of the Anglican Church. The triumph of Puritanism was effected, not by argument,

[d] I am not aware that this edition of Whitgift's Defence has hitherto been noticed, or that the peculiarities in the first edition of Cartwright's Replye have been pointed out. My impression is that neither of the works has attracted the attention of preceding writers. A copy of each is in my own possession.

but by violence and rebellion. To Cartwright's opposition we are indebted for Whitgift's *Defence*, which touches in a most masterly way on all the matters at issue between the Church of England and her opponents. To the same adversary we owe another important work; for Hooker's *Polity* would never have been written but for Cartwright's attack. To this opponent, therefore, we owe the best works in defence of the Church of England.

Puritanism was now advancing rapidly in the country. The old race was gone, and more violent men occupied their places. "The next year they entered on a business of a higher nature, which was the falsifying and corrupting of the Common Prayer-Book, the which being then published by Richard Jugge, the queen's printer, the whole order of private baptism and confirmation of children was quite omitted." For this fact, Heylin refers to a book by William Reynolds, "a virulent papist, I confess, but one that may be credited in a matter of fact, which might so easily have been refuted by the book itself."[e] There is, I believe, a slight mistake in Heylin's account respecting the printer. Such a book was actually printed by the queen's printer, Barker, in 1578, and appended to a Bible of the same year. Two versions of the Psalms were given, the *Geneva*, and that which was usually read in churches. Thus, this volume contained "The Common Prayer," in large type, for churches; and also every thing required by the minister in the performance of public worship. In this edition the word 'priest' was expunged in every rubric; and the offices for private baptism and the churching of women were altogether omitted. It has been stated, that no edition of the Prayer-Book existed without the word 'priest' in some of the rubrics, and this probably is the only one.

The object of the Puritans now was to mutilate or alter the Prayer-Book to suit their own scruples. But in

[e] Heylin's Hist. Rest. 283, 292.

a little time a bolder step was taken, and a new liturgy was actually produced, and printed by Waldegrave, about the year 1584. The edition has no date, but the period is fixed by contemporary publications in which it is mentioned. Its history is exceedingly curious, as well as illustrative of the secret practices of the Puritans with whom Elizabeth's bishops had to deal.

Of the contemporary publications in which I find this book noticed, that of Bridges, published in the year 1587, is the first. He asks, "with what authoritie they can set out a prescribed forme of their own making, and reject that that is done by authoritie?" and then alluding to their objections to forms, he asks, "who are they that have of late set forth this pamphlet, intituled *A Booke, &c.?*" giving the title of Waldegrave's book. They objected to the length of the Common Prayer, "which kept out preaching." Bridges retorts the greater length of their own: "They have as long prescribed formes as our booke prescribeth, even by many odds far longer. Have we any of all our public prayers that is but a quarter so long as some of the prayers that they have prescribed in their Booke of Common Prayer?" In reply to the objection of length, Bridges affirms, that one full morning service does not occupy more than an hour and a half in any place. Elsewhere he reminds them, in reply to their objection that the Church of England imitated Rome in the length of her service, that their form was longer, besides the liberty to the minister of extemporary prayers.[f]

The next year, 1588, Bancroft published his famous sermon, preached at Paul's Cross; and he also alludes to the Puritan Prayer-Book, entering into particulars of editions and variations. In reference to their objections, he asks: "Seeing they are so greatly offended with this

[f] A Defence of the Government established in the Church of Englande for Ecclesiastical Matters, contayning an Aunswere unto a treatise called the Learned Discourse of Eccl. Government, &c. &c. By John Bridges, Deane of Sarum. London, Windet, 1587, pp. 495, 497, 625, 635-637, 656.

booke, what is it they desire themselves? Forsooth, a booke they could be contented to have, but it must be of their own making. About fower years since, some two or three private men in a corner framed a Booke of the Fourme of Common Praier, Administration, &c.; and without any authoritie published the same as meete to be embraced in all the parish churches of England." Bancroft remarks, that the book was considered perfect, agreeable to God's Word and the use of the reformed Churches. "The next yeare another Booke of Common Praier, &c., with the like authoritie and commendation, was sent abroad. The whole forme and order of it was in a manner changed (they are so constant), and in other places and points of matter there are not so few as 600 alterations." "Within another yeare a third booke is begotten, differing in some points from both; and they have been very earnest that this should be allowed by publike authority."[g]

Bancroft alludes to this book, as well as to the other books printed at Middleburgh, in his *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, and his *Dangerous Positions*, both published in the year 1593. In the 27th of the reign of Elizabeth, they petitioned for the appointment of Waldegrave's book, "A Booke of the Forme of Common Prayers, and containing in it the effect of their whole pretended discipline." He alludes, as Bridges did, to the omission in this first book of any allusion to the civil magistrate.[h] After this period, we find allusions to the book in the writers on the controversy between the Church and the Puritans. In 1605, Hutton, replying to the ministers of Devon, refers to their petition for its establishment. They asked the queen to impose it, and not to allow of

[g] A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 9th of Februarie, being the first Sunday in the Parliament, anno 1588, by Richard Bancroft, D. of Divinite, &c. London, by J. J. for Gregorie Seton. 1588, pp. 61-64.

[h] Daungerous Positions and Proceedings, &c. London, 1593, 4to, pp. 100, 101. Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline. London, 1593, p. 66.

any other book. "Our Communion Book they like not; and of their owne, whether first, second, or third it is they approve, we know not. For so many, all differing from each other, within some few years, one after another, they set out about 20 yeares agoe to be received of our Church. 'Twixt their Book of Common Praier printed at London, and their written Booke exhibited at the parliament, the differences are 415; 'twixt their Book of Common Praier set out at Middleburgh, and their written Booke, differences 395; 'twixt their Book of Common Praier set out in London, and their other at Middleburgh, differences 123."[i]

In the year 1588, a work was published in reply to Bridges, in which this Puritan Prayer-Book is in a certain way defended. "In this place, without all manner of occasion offerd him, he falleth into the mention of a booke, which he termeth *our Communion Booke*, and sayth to be intituled *The Forme of Common Prayers, Administration of the Sacraments, &c., agreeable to God's Worde and the Use of the Reformed Churches.* Such a booke, indeede, bearing that title, there hath been much speach of, and it is saide, as it had bin twise before, so this last parliament, nowe the third time to have been presented to that high and honourable court." The writer dwells on the title, as though Bridges found no other fault with it than the expression that it was agreeable to God's Word and the use of the reformed Churches. He then assumes that the title was true, and that Bridges admitted it. He adds, that such a book would not maintain "the baptism of women, nor confirmation," &c., because they are not agreeable to God's Word. In another part of his work the author alludes to the charge of differences in their various books. "Here he resteth and taketh this one example for all, to shewe the differences amongst the reformed Churches. Which he would shewe by affirming

[i] Hutton's Reasons for Refusal of Subscription, &c., with an Answere, &c. 1606, 4to. Oxford, 1605, pp. 58, 135, 139.

of differences betweene the Scottishe Booke of Common Prayer, and the Booke presented in parliament written, and the same printed at Middelborough, at London, and at Scotlande, above three hundred differences, being a booke little bigger than an almanacke." He questions the assertion respecting the alleged differences, affirming that they should have been specified; and in reply to the statement of its size, he said it might have been bigger if it had been "stuffed with impertinent matters, as with orders for private administration of the sacraments, churching of women, buryal services, confirmation."[j]

It does not appear that any business was entered upon

[j] A Defence of the Ecclesiastical Discipline ordayned of God to be used in his Church: against a Replie of Master Bridges to a brief and plain Declaration of it: 1588, 4to, pp. 23-25, 113, 114. From this narrative it will be seen that the Puritans commenced their war against the Book of Common Prayer by procuring the publication of an edition from which the offices and expressions to which they objected were expunged. The circumstance was mentioned by Heylin from a Romish writer, for he appears not himself to have been acquainted with such a book. The peculiarities of this book, indeed, have not, I believe, been noticed by preceding writers; and I well remember being told that no such book existed. The next step adopted by the Puritans was the adoption of the book printed by Waldegrave. Waldegrave was the printer of many Puritan books against the Church, for which he got into trouble. After the printing of the Prayer-Book his presses were seized. In one of the Mar-Prelate Tracts, a dismal account is given of the breaking up of his establishment, "by John Wolfe, alias Macchivil, Beadle of the Stationers." The writer describes Waldegrave's troubles with those of his wife and "six orphans." O read over D. John Bridges, for it is a worthy worke; or an epitome of the first book of that worshipful volume, &c. printed oversea in Europe, within two furlongs of a bouncing priest, &c. 4to, pp. 23, 24. Bishop Cooper contradicts the statement about Waldegrave's character, describing him as a "godlesse person, an unthriftie spender, and consumer of the fruits of his owne labours." He also asserts that Waldegrave sold his press himself. Cooper's Admonition, &c. pp. 41, 42. Many books were seized by the government, and sometimes the presses were removed before the works were completed. The first edition of Knox's Historie was seized before it was finished, and no perfect copy of the work is known to exist. The authors of the *Christian Letter* ask Hooker about various books, and he asks their opinion of several others, among which is "The Ecclesiastical History almost fully printed out in the Blackfriers." Keble's Hooker, preface, p. xiv. It was printed by Vautrollier.

in the province of York, which met in 1576, beyond the grant of the usual subsidy.[k]

The convocation was prorogued from time to time until the year 1580, when it was assembled in the province of Canterbury.[l] At this time Grindal was under sequestration, and consequently the Bishop of London presided. An address was presented to the queen for his restoration; but whether from the convocation or only from the clergy is not certain. Fuller, indeed, states that the convocation petitioned the queen in his favour. The subject was probably discussed in convocation; but the actual proceedings cannot be ascertained.[m]

Some other matters were, however, treated of. A motion was submitted relative to the enforcement of the preceding Articles, and another respecting the *Family of Love;* and there were certain discussions on the subject of excommunication; but nothing was concluded except the grant of the usual subsidy. In the convocation of York the subsidy was the only business.[n]

We now proceed to the latter part of the year 1584, when the convocations of both provinces were assembled. York only granted a subsidy, being prorogued from time to time without transacting business.[o] In Canterbury

[k] Wilkins, iv. 288. [l] Ib iv. 292.

[m] Collier, ii. 552; Strype's Grindal, 291; Fuller, ix. 120. The petition is preserved by Fuller. Wake's State, 503. Heylin states that meetings of the archbishop's friends, who were members of convocation, took place; and they were anxious not to proceed to business, not even to grant the subsidy, until his restoration; while others advised a petition from both houses. He remarks that there was nothing in the public registers to prove that such a petition was adopted by the convocation, though one was drawn up by Tobie Matthew, Dean of Christ Church, and presented to the queen. Grindal continued under suspension till his death. Heylin's Hist. Presb. 288, 289; Wake's State, 503.

[n] Wake's State, 503, 606; Fuller, ix. 135; Strype's Grindal, 382-389. The forms of excommunication and penance were submitted to the convocation, but not passed. Wilkins, iv. 292, 293, 295-301.

[o] Wilkins, iv. 315; Wake's State, 504. The synod of York met also in 1581. Wilkins, iv. 302. A curious circumstance occurred in 1580 in the

several topics were brought under discussion. A clergyman was summoned to answer a charge of heresy, it being alleged that he had said that "the Old and New Testaments were fables," with other blasphemous expressions. He acknowledged his error; and in his abjuration all the erroneous doctrines are specified. Penance was enjoined to this effect, that he should attend at Paul's Cross on the following Sunday, standing before the preacher with a fagot on his shoulder; that he should recant his heresies in the church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields before the lower house of convocation; and that he should not venture to preach until duly licensed by the archbishop.[p]

But the most important business related to certain articles, which were agreed upon in this convocation, and afterwards published. They relate to the admission of proper persons into holy orders; to the commutation of penance; to marriage, excommunication, pluralities, and to the *fees* paid in ecclesiastical courts.[q] Attached to them is a *memo-*

House of Commons. The Liturgy was usually read in the house before the commencement of business. Wentworth moved that there should be a sermon every day; but the motion fell to the ground. Heylin's Presb. 287. In 1583 Whitgift became archbishop, and subscription was strictly enjoined. Many publications were published against the bishops, in which Whitgift is especially marked out as the cause of what was termed the persecution. "Who can deny that it came from the humour of one man?" "Against almost the former practice of three or four and twenty yeres' experience. But came all this alone from himself? Satan herein hath also his finger, without all doubt." The Unlawful Practice of Prelates against God's Ministers, the Maintainers of the Discipline of God. 12mo. This book is without date and place, and is unpaged. It is reprinted in Parte of a Register.

[p] Strype's Whitgift, i. 399, 400; Fuller, ix. 175, 176; Collier, ii. 595. All through this reign the convocation exercised the power of condemning erroneous opinions. Wilkins, iv. 306, 307. The lower house petitioned the queen against the bill concerning pluralities. Ib. 308; Tanner Mss. 282.

[q] Articuli per Archiepiscopum, Episcopos et reliquum Clerum Cantuariensis provinciæ in synodo inchoata Londini vicesimo quarto die mensis Novembris anno Domini 1584, regnique serenissimæ in Christo principis dominæ Elizabethæ Dei gratia Angliæ, Franciæ, et Hyberniæ reginæ, fidei defensoris, &c. vicesimo septimo stabiliti, et regia auctoritate approbati et confirmati. Londini, in ædibus C. B. 4to. Sparrow's Collections; Strype's Whitgift, i. 396, vol. iii. 145-50; Strype's Annals, III. i. 330; Cardwell's Synodalia.

randum to the effect that the bishops should inquire into the condition, state, learning, and quality of the clergy; by whom and when they were ordained; and of what calling they were previous to ordination.[r]

Certain *orders for the clergy* were sanctioned by convocation in 1585. Some of them are curious as indicative of the state of learning among the clergy at that time.[s] The order in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer concerning the daily service is enjoined to be observed, in order that the clergy may become better acquainted with the Scriptures. To those ministers who were not masters of arts the ordinary was authorised to assign one chapter of the Old or New Testament to be studied, the parties to render an account in Latin, or in English if unable to do it in Latin, to the Bishop. A commonplace, or essay, was also to be given every quarter, upon which they were to write their ideas. These exercises appear to have been intended as a substitute for the *prophesyings* which had been prohibited.[t]

[r] Strype's Whitgift, iii. 150; Wilkins, iv. 315-317. York met in 1585; ib. 319.

[s] Strype's Whitgift, i 400.

[t] "Twentieth session, March 31, 1585. Articles received by convocation, confirmed by the queen. Orders for the increase of learning in ministers. 1. To get pftly the order of reading the Common Prayer appointed in the preface. 2. To study weekly a chapter of the Old or New Testament, and make notes thereupon, to be appointed by the ordinary. 3. The bishop shall appoint them every quarter a commonplace of divinity, to write thereupon and answere in Latine. 4. Those that are not able to doe it in Latine to doe it in English. 5. The ordinary, or some appointed by him, shall call them to account for the exercises." Tanner Mss. vol. 282. In the *Plea of the Innocent*, the more moderate Puritans speak of their petition to convocation in 1585 about subscription. "For this cause we exhibited an humble petition to the reverend assembly of convocation, holden anno 1585, with our reasons why we refused to subscribe in such ample manner as they required." p 21. The Plea of the Innocent spoke the language of the more moderate Puritans, who disavowed all connexion with the *Mar-Prelate Tracts*, calling the writer "a foolish jester, who termed himself *Martin Mar-Prelate* and his sons, which under counterfeit and apish scoffing did play the sycophant." They say, "Howsoever it was, the blame lighted upon us, and we by it obtained a new name; in many pulpits (how justly God knoweth) we are

In the next year other orders were put forth. Every minister with cure of souls, under the degree of M.A. or B.C.L., and not licensed to be a public preacher, was ordered to provide a *Bible*, Bullinger's *Decades* in Latin or English, and a *paper book;* to read over weekly one sermon in the *Decades*, noticing the chief matters in the *paper book*, and to shew his notes to some clergyman, appointed for that purpose, once in every quarter. The penalty for refusal was, first, admonition; then, in the case of incumbents, ecclesiastical censure; and in that of curates, an inhibition. At the close is the following order, evidently in allusion to the prophesyings, which had been suppressed:—"It is concluded that the exercises above written, and no other, shall be henceforth publicly or privately used within every part of this province."[u]

The complaints and petitions exhibited in this convocation prove that some of the clergy were very negligent in conducting divine service. In short, Puritanism was advancing among the clergy to a considerable extent. A complaint was exhibited in the lower house from the diocese of Norwich, which refers, however, more to the negligence of the bishop than to that of the clergy. Another was presented from the archdeaconry of Suffolk, in which it was stated that the communion was either not at all or only partially administered; that the surplice was not worn; that holydays were not observed; and that when the sacrament was administered, many persons received the elements sitting, while those who conformed with the prescribed order of the Church were called *time-servers*. These complaints are clear evidence of the irregularities which prevailed; and they further prove that the charge of undue severity in pressing conformity is not correct.[v]

called 'Martinistes.' So that it plainly appeared to the wiser and discreter sorte, that the devil was the author of this disgrace." Ib. 32, 33.

[u] Strype's Whitgift, iii. 194-196; Wilkins, iv. 321, 322; Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 562, 563.

[v] Strype's Whitgift, i. 496, 497; Tanner Mss. vol. 282. The lower house

The Puritans were now rather clamorous for changes in the services and ceremonies of the Church, under the plea of a further reformation. Various matters were therefore discussed in the parliament, where the Puritans had considerable strength. Some of the members, it appears, petitioned the queen on the subject; and her answer is characterised by her usual good sense and sound reasoning. "Her majesty thinketh, that though it were granted that some things were amiss in the Church, yet seeing she is fully persuaded, and knoweth it to be true, that for the very substance and grounds of true religion, no man living can justly control them: to make every day new laws in matters of circumstances and of less moment (especially touching religion), were a means to breed great lightness in her subjects, to nourish an unstayed humour in them, in seeking still for exchanges."[w]

The convocation of York met also in 1586, and an order was made for the payment of a fixed sum to the proctors. "In respect of the pains and attendance of the proctors and their substitutes appearing in this present convocation, &c. it is now ordered and decreed by the said prelates and clergy." A sum is fixed to be paid by the bishops and clergy appearing by proctors. In the form of the grant the bishops and clergy ask for a license to treat of canons concerning the same. "We, your prelates and clergy, most humbly beseech your majesty, &c., not only to accept of this small gift of ours, but also by your majesty's letters patent to assent thereunto, and to license and authorise us to devise, make, and ordain decrees, or constitutions provincial and synodal, as we shall think most expedient for the more speedy and sure levying of the said benevolence." The queen assented to the subsidy, and by license allowed them to do what was necessary for its collection. Accord-

was occupied with various matters of form in this convocation. In the sixth session the clergy were admonished by the archbishop to observe the canons. Syn. Ang. app. 138-143.

[w] Strype's Whitgift, i. 495.

ingly they enacted, by the royal license, a series of constitutions relative to the mode of collection. The bishops were required to appoint clergymen of knowledge and ability for the work; "for so is used in the other province." They did not deem themselves at liberty even to issue rules for collecting the subsidy for the crown, after it was voted. In the province of Canterbury the same process had been adopted. Letters patent were issued by the queen accepting the subsidy, and allowing the synod to make constitutions respecting the mode of its collection.[x]

In 1587 nothing appears to have been transacted in convocation; but in the memorable year of the Spanish Armada, the synod was summoned for November 13th, and prorogued until February, when a large subsidy was granted to enable the crown to repel the invasion.[y] It was known that the continental Romanists were plotting the destruction of England. Two priests had recanted at Paul's Cross—Anthony Tyrrell and William Tydder; and to provide them with the means of support, the archbishop solicited aid from the clergy in convocation.[z] Certain articles also respecting residences, which had been put forth by the queen's authority, were submitted to both houses by the archbishop. In the province of York no measures were introduced; but the convocation was prorogued from time to time until the dissolution.[a]

In 1592 the convocation of Canterbury met with the new parliament; and Andrews, so celebrated for his pulpit oratory, preached the usual sermon.[b] Two papers are mentioned by Strype, who refers to *Extracts of Convoca-*

[x] Wilkins, iv. 323-328; Wake's State, 606-608, 613.

[y] Syn. Ang. app. 169.

[z] Strype's Whitgift, i. 538; Syn. Ang. app. 170, 171.

[a] Wake's State, 504, 505; Wilkins, iv. 335, 336. Both convocations had been continued from time to time in 1590, and then dissolved. Wilkins, iv. 340, 341.

[b] Strype's Whitgift, ii. 141, 142; Tanner Mss. 282; Wilkins, iv. 343, 344.

tions, then in the possession of Atterbury, which appear to have been submitted to convocation. The one was a paper of questions and answers respecting marriage within degrees of affinity; the other related to certain *orders* agreed upon by the bishops. It is, however, uncertain whether any business was actually transacted; and in York nothing beyond matters of form and the usual subsidy was even attempted.[c]

The convocation met in London in 1597. It appears that the practice had prevailed of choosing the deans and archdeacons, in some dioceses, proctors of the clergy, by which means, as those individuals had seats *ex officio*, the number of members was diminished. To put an end to such a practice, Whitgift ordered the following document to be issued:—

"His Grace did, since the mandate sent unto me, signify his opinion that he found some inconveniences in former convocations, that sometimes either the dean or some of the archdeacons, in some dioceses, are chosen proctors for the clergy of their diocese, whereby the appearance that is required at that solemn assembly is not so furnished as it ought to be. And therefore his Grace willed me to require your lordship to premonish your clergy, that no dean or archdeacon be chosen proctor for the clergy of your diocese.

"William Blackwell."[d]

Early in the session the attention of the upper house was directed to the subject of parish registers, which had been very irregularly kept in some places. It was proposed that previous injunctions should be enforced; that the books should be of parchment; and that the entries should be made in a clear and legible hand.[e] It was also ordered that the names of all who had been married, christened, and buried, should be published in the church the

[c] Strype's Whitgift, ii. 143; Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 577; Collier, ii. 637; Wake's State, 505; Wilkins, iv. 343, 345.

[d] Wake's State, 505.

[e] Strype's Whitgift, ii. 378, 379.

Sunday after the entries had been made. This was evidently intended to secure a regular entry. A chest also was to be kept in the church, for the preservation of the books, with three locks, the keys of which were to be in possession of the minister and the two churchwardens. The regulation respecting the chests and the keys is still regarded in some parishes; though the registers, by the new act, are kept in iron chests, and in the custody of the clergyman.

The archbishop also submitted to the consideration of the house certain complaints respecting the dress of the clergy, the negligence of prebendaries in cathedrals, clandestine marriages, divorces, and other matters of a similar description.[f]

In this convocation some constitutions were authorised and then published. They are arranged under twelve heads. The *first* relates to the persons to be admitted to holy orders and to benefices; the *second*, to pluralities; the *third* enjoins hospitality on beneficed clergymen; the *fourth*, that deans and canons should preach in turn in cathedrals; the *fifth* refers to marriage; the *sixth* to the question of divorce; the *seventh* to excommunication; the *eighth* to recusants; the *ninth* to penance; the *tenth* to the fees of ecclesiastical officers; the *eleventh* to apparitors; and the *last* to the custody of parish registers. They were published by authority of the queen, after having been confirmed in convocation.[g]

In the province of York the subsidy was the only business of importance.[h]

[f] Strype's Whitgift, ii. 379, 380.

[g] Capitula sive Constitutiones Ecclesiasticæ per Archiepiscopum, Episcopos, et reliquum Clerum Cantuariensis provinciæ, &c. 1597. Sparrow's Collections; Strype's Whitgift, ii. 383, 384; Collier, ii. 667; Cardwell's Synod, i. 147; Wilkins, iv. 352-357. In the 23d session the archbishop produced the queen's letters patent approving of the constitutions. The convocation was dissolved by royal writ. Ib.; Atterbury, app. 56, 57; Wake's State, 614, 615.

[h] Wake's State, 506; Wilkins, iv. 357.

Queen Elizabeth's last parliament met in 1601, and the convocation of both provinces assembled at the same time. In Canterbury a subsidy was granted; and the archbishop exhorted the bishops to diligence in their charges, and recommended that they should enforce the late canons. Barlow preached at the opening of this convocation; and Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, was chosen prolocutor of the lower house.[i]

[i] Strype's Whitgift, ii. 446; Fuller, ix. cent. xvii. p. 3; Wake's State, 506; Wilkins, iv. 363, 364. In the province of York nothing was attempted beyond the grant of a subsidy.

A remarkable account was published of the recantations of Tyrrell and Tydder:—The Recantations as they were severallie pronounced by Wylliam Tedder and Anthony Tyrrell (sometime two Seminarie Priests of the English College in Rome, and nowe by the great mercie of Almightie God converted unto the Profession of the Gospel of Jesus Christ) at Paules Crosse, the day and yeare as is mentioned in their severall tytles of theyr recantations. With an Epistle dedicatorie unto her Magestie, and their several prefaces unto the Reader, contayning the Causes that mooved them to the same. At London, printed by John Charlewood, anno Domini M.D.LXXXVIII. On the back of the title of this curious volume is a half-length portrait of Queen Elizabeth, to whom the work is dedicated. In their recantations both individuals mention the causes which led to their separation from the Church of Rome, among which is particularly specified "the wicked counsell and devillish devises of the Pope and his children against the Queenes Magestie, and our most deere countrey." p. 9.

CHAPTER VIII.

A.D. 1602-1625.

James I.—Convocation, 1604—Canons—Analysis of them—Bidding Prayers—Ratification of Canons—Alterations in Liturgy—Convocation, 1605—Proceedings in province of York on the Canons—They are adopted—Their authority—Convocation, 1606—Overall's book—Its contents—Proceedings during remainder of this reign.

James I. summoned his first parliament in March A.D. 1603, the convocation meeting at the same time, according to the usual practice. The see of Canterbury being vacant by the death of Whitgift, the writ was issued to the Bishop of London, as dean of the province. They met in London, March 20th, 1603. The convocation of York met also; but as no business of importance was transacted in that province, our attention will be confined to the proceedings in the province of Canterbury.[a]

At the second session Dr. Ravis was presented to the bishops as prolocutor of the lower house. Two other sessions passed over without business; but on the 13th of April the Bishop of London exhibited the royal license, authorising them, according to the powers vested in the crown by the Act of Submission, to make canons and constitutions. The license bears the date of April 12, 1604.[b]

[a] Wake's State, 507. The Hampton Court conference need not be particularly noticed in this work. It may suffice to remark, that some changes were introduced into the Book of Common Prayer, which were probably suggested by the discussions in that assembly. Barlow's account was complained of by the Puritans, but without reason. I have an edition of Barlow's book, in French, published in the year 1605. The canons of 1604, in the same language, are appended to the volume.

[b] Wake's State, 617; Atterbury, 129; Wilkins, iv. 378, 379. A committee of bishops and others was appointed "to confer with the speaker and others of the House of Commons about complaints before them brought

It appears that the king had addressed a letter to the convocation, dated the 20th of March, requesting them to hasten a collection for the town of Geneva; but the consideration of the canons was the commencement of the regular synodical business.[c] The canons, which were subsequently passed, were submitted to the convocation by the Bishop of London on the 2d of May.

The following clause from the royal declaration prefixed to the book asserts the principle on which the convocation is permitted to make canons and constitutions:

"We, for divers urgent and weighty causes and considerations us thereunto especially moving, of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, did, by virtue of our prerogative, royal and supreme authority in causes ecclesiastical, give and grant, by our several letters patent, under our great seal of England, the one dated the 12th day of April last past, and the other the 25th day of June then next following, full, free, and lawful liberty, license, power, and authority, unto the said Lord Bishop of London, president of the said convocation, and the rest of the clergy before mentioned of the said province, that they from time to time during our first parliament, now prorogued, might confer, treat, celebrate, consider, consult, and agree, of and upon such canons, orders, ordinances, and constitutions, as they should think necessary, fit, and

against the clergy, and that the bishops also tell the said speaker and commons of grievances put upon the clergy by the laity. April 8th, 1604. The Bishop of London tells the lower house that the speaker and commons refuse the consultation, and have made their complaints to the lords." Tanner Mss. 282.

[c] Wake's State, 617; Atterbury, 129; Wilkins, iv. 378, 379-405. "May 2d, 1604. The Bishop of London delivers y^e^ prolocutor a booke of canons, desiring him to take to him a committee of eight or ten to consider of them. A petition by Egerton, Fleetwood, and Wotton, and others, for reformation of the Book of Common Prayer, imparted to the lower house in presence of the petitioners. The Bishop of London and bishops admonish the petitioners to be obedient, and conforme together with their adherents before St. John Baptist next. 13 Session. A committee of both houses to consider the booke of canons and despatch it." Tanner Mss. vol. 282.

convenient for the honour and service of Almighty God, the good and quiet of the Church, and the better government thereof."

This was in accordance with the Act of Submission. In the *first* place the convocation was assembled by royal writ; *secondly*, the king granted his license to make canons, as it is expressed in the declaration prefixed to the book; *thirdly*, when the book was completed, he gave it his ratification, as will be noticed subsequently, without which the canons would not have been of any force.

The subjects of some of the canons gave rise to discussions in the two houses, but they were agreed upon without any difficulty. These canons are of great importance, being the only body of ecclesiastical laws by which the Anglican Church is still governed. Some notice of them is therefore necessary. From the Reformation the Church had been governed by the old canon law, and by such constitutions and injunctions as had been set forth by synodical and royal authority since that period. It was now deemed desirable to form all these into one body, in order that the clergy might be acquainted with the laws by which the Church was governed.

They are in number *one hundred and forty-one*. In all probability they were collected and arranged by Bancroft, who selected them from the synodical acts, royal injunctions, and articles, which had been set forth during the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth. The canons of 1571 and 1597 were especially regarded in the compilation; but some new ones were added.[d]

The *first* canon asserts the royal supremacy in causes ecclesiastical. All persons having cure of souls are enjoined, at least four times every year, to make a declaration against any foreign jurisdiction. The *second* is also

[d] Collier, ii. 687; Fuller, x. 28; Heylin's Tracts, 149. The canons in the reign of Elizabeth were confirmed for her life only; consequently the convocation proceeded with great expedition, on James's accession, in arranging our present canons. Gibson, 994; Heylin's Presbyterians, 375.

directed against impugners of the supremacy; and the *fourth* asserts the Church of England to be a true and apostolic Church. The next *five* relate to the impugners of the worship, the articles, the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and the ordination-service; and the remaining canons of this division are directed against schismatics and conventicles. These latter canons are now set aside by the operation of the Act of Toleration, by which separate worship is allowed.

The second division is entitled, "*Of Divine Service and Administration of the Sacraments;*" and it comprehends eighteen canons. The celebration of divine service on Sundays and holydays is enjoined; and persons are exhorted, not only to attend public worship, but to visit the sick and the poor. The Litany is enjoined to be used on Wednesdays and Fridays. It would seem that the Litany was read alone on those days at that time, as is still the case in some college chapels, though such a course is not now authorised by the Book of Common Prayer; for since the last review it is appointed to be said after morning prayer. By the old rubrics it was not specified that it should come after the usual morning service, as is the case since 1661; but undoubtedly it was read after the rest of the service on Sundays. On Wednesdays and Fridays it was probably read alone. The words are express: "Upon Wednesdays and Fridays, the minister at the accustomed hours of service shall resort to the church or chapel, and shall say the litany prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer." By the seventeenth canon it is enjoined that no man should cover his head in the time of service; and due and lowly reverence is to be observed at the name of Jesus. As this point was one of the stumbling-blocks to the Puritans; and since some persons still raise objections against the practice, it may be desirable to give the views of the Church of England on the subject, as expressed in this convocation. "When in time of divine service the name of the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly re-

verence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true and eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind for this life and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised." There is nothing of popery in this language; yet some persons bring the charge against the Anglican Church on the ground of this practice enjoined in the canon. With quite as much reason may the charge be alleged against Dissenters for observing many things which are common to them and the Church of Rome.

The thirtieth canon explains the use of the sign of the cross in baptism; and the explanation is perfectly satisfactory: "We are sorry that his majesty's most princely care and pains taken in the conference at Hampton Court, amongst many other points, touching this one of the cross at baptism hath taken no better effect with many, but still the use of it in baptism is so greatly stuck at and impugned."

Such is the commencement of the canon; after which various arguments are used in defence of the practice. It is well remarked in the canon, "The abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it."[e] It is remarkable

[e] James, with the good sense which, notwithstanding his pedantry, marked much of his conversation, replied to Rainolds, at the Hampton Court conference, that the abuse of the sign of the cross in the time of popery was an evidence that it was not abused before the time of popery. By such an argument he contended that the Trinity might be renounced, since it was abused in the time of popery. Turning to Rainolds, his majesty said, "They used to wear hose and shoes in popery, therefore you shall now go barefoot." If, indeed, every thing must be rejected which has come to us through the Church of Rome, we should be compelled to reject the Scriptures; for during the dark ages the sacred text was preserved by that Church. This argument is admirably put by Whitgift in his reply to Cartwright respecting confirmation. Cartwright contended for giving it up altogether in consequence of the abuse. Whitgift answered: "If that be a sufficient reason to abolishe it, bycause it hathe bene horribly abused, then what shall you reteyne, either

that this canon also confirms, at least by implication, the *Apology* of Jewell. At all events the mention of it in such a manner is an evidence that it was regarded at that time as a book duly authorised.

The next division of the canons relates to "*Ministers, their ordination, function, and charge.*" Under this division are comprehended the times for ordination, the titles, qualifications, and examination of ministers. The thirty-sixth contains *three articles*, which are subscribed by all clergymen at ordination, and also on being instituted to a benefice or licensed to a curacy. Whitgift had previously introduced them at a period when Puritanism was making considerable progress among the clergy, and they were now embodied in the canons. They relate to the royal supremacy, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Thirty-nine Articles; and as all societies must be governed by laws, it appears strange that these Articles should ever have been objected to by men who wished to serve in the Anglican Church.

Institution, simony, pluralities, residence, preachers, and other similar subjects, are regulated under this division. At that time there were two licenses: one authorising a clergyman to perform the duties of the Church in general, but not to preach; the other a special license to preach. Even beneficed men were sometimes unable to preach. The prohibition originated in the circumstances of the Church at the Reformation, when some of the clergy could not be trusted. Thus the 45th canon appoints that *beneficed men allowed to be preachers*, and residing, shall preach every Sunday; but the next canon enacts, that *beneficed men not allowed to be preachers* shall procure a preacher once every month. In these cases homilies were

in the churche or in the common lyfe of man? But I have before, in talking of apparell, declared the vanitie of this reason; and yet the confirmation that is now used was never abused by the papistes, for they had it not, neyther any similitude of it, but only the name, whiche cannot contaminate the thyng." Whitgift's Defence, 1574, p. 726.

to be read on those Sundays on which there was no allowed preacher, and it was for this purpose that they were originally set forth. During the reign of Elizabeth, and at the time when these canons were framed, many were necessarily ordained to the ministry who were not well qualified to instruct the people. To meet the case, therefore, the plan of granting a special license to preach was adopted, while homilies were prepared for those who were not licensed; and thus the bishops had a guarantee that the truth would be proclaimed in all churches. Thus the 46th and 49th canons specify that the homilies already published should be read by those ministers who were not licensed to preach; while the same privilege was extended to any other which might afterwards be published by lawful authority.

The 55th canon settles the question of the prayer to be used before sermon. "Before all sermons, lectures, and homilies, the preachers and ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer, in this form or to this effect, as briefly as conveniently they may." The form in the canon is a request to the people to pray:—"He shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." The king, the queen, and royal family are next specified; then the clergy, the king's council, the nobility, and the commons; and the form concluded with praise for those who are departed in the faith, and a prayer for grace to be enabled to follow their example. It was, therefore, a *bidding* to pray; and hence the title, the *Bidding Prayer*.

A form somewhat similar was used in England before the Reformation.[f] "Ye shulle stonde up and bydde your bedys in the worshepe of oure Lord Jhesu Christ and his moder Seynte Marye." Such was the commencement of

[f] Gibson's Codex, p. 381; Coxe's Forms of Bidding Prayer, Oxford, 1840, pp. 11-13.

the form, which was in use a considerable time before the Reformation. The people were called upon to pray for the pope and his cardinals. This was natural. But they were also instructed to pray for the patriarch of Jerusalem. The archbishop and bishops, monks and friars, are mentioned before the king. "Ye shall bydde for the king of England, for the queen, and for alle her childryne." The following are curious clauses:—"Ye shulle bidde for the gwode man and the gwode wyf. Ye shulle kneele adoun and bydde for fader's sawle, for moder's sawle, for godfader's sawle, for godmoder's sawle, for godchildren's sawles, and for all the sawles of our bredryn and soosters' sawles, and for all the sawles that we bet in dette for to bid therefore, and for all the sawles that beet in purgatoree."[g]

When Henry VIII. assumed the title of supreme head of the Church of England, an alteration was made in the bidding prayer. The name of the pope was omitted, but those of the king and queen were retained. In the form, as it stood at that time, the souls of the dead were also specified.[h] Also in the *Injunctions* of Edward VI., A.D. 1547, which contain a form for the bidding of prayer, prayers for the dead are enjoined. Queen Elizabeth's *Injunctions* were published A.D. 1559. They also contain a *form*, but the clause respecting the dead is omitted. It would seem that this *form* was chiefly regarded by those who framed the canons of 1604.[i]

It appears from various sermons extant, that in the

[g] Collier, ii. app. 60; Coxe's Bidding Prayers, 18, 19, 29-34, 38, 39-43, 45, 49; Le Strange's Alliance, &c. 171, 172.

[h] Heylin's Tracts, 150; Collier, ii. 227.

[i] Sparrow's Collections; Heylin's Tracts, 149-161. The whole subject is fully discussed by Heylin. King Edward's prayer was the same as that of Henry VIII. Queen Elizabeth's was altered, praying for the dead being changed into praise for their departure. The form in the 55th canon is very similar; Coxe's Forms, 51-59, 93-96. Hilsey gives the form in use in 1539. Hilsey's Primer; Heylin's Eccles. Rest. 37; Foxe's Sermon, 1570. The prayer in this sermon occupies several pages.

early period of the Reformation it was not the general practice to use the prayer, or to *bid to prayer*, until the sermon was commenced. Thus in one of Latimer's sermons before the convocation in the reign of Henry VIII., A.D. 1536, he first names his text and enters upon his subject, and then calls upon the people to pray.[j] So, at a much later period, Jewell, after he had entered upon the subject, and made his arrangement, called upon the people to pray, mentioning the topics according to the order in the queen's Injunctions. The original practice, therefore, was to commence the sermon, and then to call upon the people to unite in prayer with the preacher; and the *form* laid down in the Injunctions was always followed until the Puritans began to use extempore prayer. In one instance Latimer occupies several pages before he comes to the prayer. Archbishop Parker on one occasion concludes his sermon with the bidding prayer. In all the cases too there is some variation in the form; so that the practice with respect to the exact words was not uniform.[k]

The practice of commencing the sermon before the prayer existed after the Restoration. We have a sermon preached in 1660 at the first consecration of bishops after that event, in which the preacher occupies three pages before he comes to the prayer. He not only introduces the text, but enunciates his plan; and then follows the prayer, modelled after the form in the canon.[l]

[j] Latimer's Sermons, ed. 1578, p. 8. "Wherein we shall pray for our most gratious soveraigne Lorde the King, chief and supreme head of the Church of England under Christ, and for the most excellent, gratious, and vertuous Lady Queene Jane."

[k] Le Strange's Alliance, 173; Coxe's Forms.

[l] A Sermon preached in St. Peter's, Westminster, on the first Sunday in Advent, at the consecration of the Right Reverend Fathers in God, John Lord Bishop of Durham, William Lord Bishop of St. David's, Benjamin Lord Bishop of Peterborough, Hugh Lord Bishop of Llandaff, Richard Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Brian Lord Bishop of Chester, and John Lord Bishop of Exeter. By W. S. B. D. 4to, London, 1660. Sancroft was the author. In 1670 John Lake published a sermon which had been preached at

What, then, is the injunction of the Church on this subject? It is clear that she pursues a moderate course. She does not bind her ministers to the precise *form* in the 55th canon. They may use that *form*, or another like it;

Whitehall on the 29th of May. After several pages, he says, having given an account of his plan, "but before I descend to these particulars, let us pray that God will be merciful, &c. &c., and crown the miraculous mercies of this day with that of a joyful and blissful eternity." He then proceeds, "pray we herein," &c., following the bidding prayer in a certain sense, though departing from the Canon by a large extension of certain parts. The petitions for the King and the Duke of York occupy more than a page. Lake's Sermon, pp. 6-9. Both Sancroft and Lake, in their prayers, allude to the previous troubles; the former saying, "Let us pray for the commons, that, remembering at last from whence they are fallen, they may repent and do the first works," p. 5. The latter blesses God "for the happy restoration of our dread sovereign to his kingdoms, and therein of the kingdoms to themselves." South preaching, in 1662, before Charles II., "after he had performed his obeisance to his Majesty, named his text, and then, after a witty preamble, he proceeded to the division of the words; and having performed that, &c., he lays by the text for the present, and, according to the ancient and laudable manner, addressed himself to the bid-prayer, which being ended, he resumed his text." Kennet's Register, 658; Wood's Athenæ, iv. 636; Sharpe on the Rubrics and Canons. In 1718 Wheatly published "Bidding of Prayers before Sermon no mark of disaffection to the present Government, or an historical Vindication of the 55th Canon, &c." 8vo. Injunctions were issued to the clergy by George I., among which was one on the 55th canon. Some of the clergy complied with it, using the bidding prayer; but, oddly enough, they incurred the charge of disaffection, as if they would only call upon the people to pray for the king. Wheatly shews that bidding prayers had been prescribed from the Reformation, and they had recently been enjoined by George I. and the Bishop of London. He had prayed for Queen Anne in a form of invocation; but when George I. required the clergy to adhere to the canon, he complied. The Bishop of London stated that the practice was correct, yet it was regarded as a mark of disaffection. This led to Wheatly's "Historical Vindication," defending the practice, though he does not condemn the invocatory form. It was strange that a compliance with the royal injunction should be called disaffection. In 1720 another work appeared: "A Defence of Praying before Sermon, as directed by the 55th Canon," 8vo, London. The writer goes on the principle that the topics or heads of the canons are to be turned into a prayer. He admits the royal order, and that it was intended to bring the clergy to pray for the king under his proper titles; but he remarks that "the people do not think that the ministers pray for the king who use the letter of the canon, who say, pray ye, or ye shall pray," p. 6. He therefore recom-

but undoubtedly they are bound, if they use what may be termed extempore prayer, to follow the method pointed out in the canon. That method is as follows:—*First*, the substance,—to pray for the Church, the sovereign and the royal family, and the lords spiritual and temporal. *Secondly*, the words of the canon are to be used, or words nearly similar. *Thirdly*, the prayer is to be brief, *as briefly as conveniently they may*. Thus the Church intends that either in these very words, or in other words of a similar import, the minister should move the people to prayer. While, therefore, the clergy use a prayer to the same effect as that contained in the canon, there is no breach of the injunctions of the Church.[m]

mended the words, "Let us pray." Heylin thought that the minister was not bound to the precise form in the canon, but that he might use his own words, provided they were to the same effect. Heylin's Tracts, pp. 27, 36. Trimnel, Bishop of Norwich in the reign of Queen Anne, declared himself against the bidding prayer, as not so agreeable to the nature of the service, the long and general practice of the Church, and the design of the canon. He states that Bishops Ravis and Fletcher, who drew up the 55th canon, always used a form of their own. He refers to Williams's Visitation Articles, 1641; Biog. Brit art. Trimnel. The subject had excited attention in Queen Anne's reign, nay even in King William's. In William's reign, it is stated that the practice of using a collect and the Lord's prayer commenced; and it is intimated by Kennet that some adopted the practice to evade "the recognition of the royal supremacy, contrary to express canon and the usage of the clergy from the beginning of the Reformation." In 1695 the Archbishop of Canterbury mentions a rumour that "it is the manner of some in every diocese either to use only the Lord's prayer, or at least to leave out the king's titles, and to forbear to pray for the bishops as such." He therefore enjoined them to keep to the effect of the canon. The Wisdom of Looking Backward, 88, 89. In the year 1619 it was observed that different forms were used before sermon in the presence of the king. To preserve uniformity, Archbishop Abbot addressed a letter to the bishops enjoining the observation of the canon. Wilkins, iv. 450. It is worthy of observation, that in the time of King William the present practice of using a collect with the Lord's prayer would have been regarded as a mark of disaffection to the government.

[m] In the convocation of 1661 a committee of the lower house was appointed to compile a form of prayer to be used before sermon; but nothing was concluded. Wren was very particular in enforcing the bidding prayer after he became a bishop; and his previous practice was in accordance with

The usual practice now is to use a collect with the Lord's prayer. And it may be observed, that the practice of extempore prayer, unless it be a prayer modelled exactly after the form in the canon, is quite unauthorised, and is a reflection on the reformers and on the liturgy which the Church has prescribed.

It is questionable whether all the clergy observe the 56th canon, which enacts that those who chiefly attend to preaching, leaving other duties to be performed by their curates, shall read the morning and evening service twice, and administer the sacrament of baptism twice in every year. Catechising is enjoined by the 59th canon. Our reformers thought much of catechising; in the present day, perhaps, it is not sufficiently regarded. The canon ordains that the young shall be catechised for half an hour or more before evening prayer, on the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, every Sunday. The rubric also enjoins catechising, though the time specified is after the second lesson at evening service, and not before the commencement, as in the canon. But both the rubrics and the canon enjoin the practice. The 61st orders the clergy to see that none be presented for confirmation until they are acquainted with the catechism in the Book of Common Prayer. By the 65th and 66th canons all ministers are commanded to confer with *recusants* or *papists* residing in their respective parishes.

In the visitation of the sick, the Church gives the ministers a discretionary power. Those who have no license to preach are to use the order in the Book of Common Prayer; but preachers are allowed by the 67th canon to act as they "*think most needful and convenient.*" As, therefore, the usual license is now considered a preaching license, all the clergy are at liberty to exercise their

his subsequent injunctions. In a sermon in 1627 he calls upon the people to pray after the text is named and the scheme stated. Wren's Sermon at Whitehall before the King, 1627, 4to, p. 5. Archbishop Sharp was accustomed to use an extempore prayer. Evelyn, iii.

own discretion. This canon also mentions the passing bell: "When any is passing out of this life, a bell shall be tolled, and the minister shall not then slack to do his last duty." It is questionable whether such a custom, though enjoined, would not now be stigmatised as *popish*. The canon adds, "And after the party's death there shall be rung no more but one short peal, and one other before the burial, and one other after the burial." This custom is still observed in all our churches.

Several of the succeeding canons relate to burials, baptisms, and the keeping of the registers. The chests appointed by the canons still remain in most parishes, and are used for the parish books, the registers being now kept in a separate chest of iron, according to an act of parliament in the reign of George III.

The 72d canon was evidently levelled against the prophesyings, which had been suppressed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. "Ministers not to appoint public or private fasts, or prophesyings, or to exercise, but by authority." By the 75th canon, *cards* are prohibited to the clergy; so that those individuals who argue, that on scriptural grounds such amusements cannot be condemned, should bear in mind that their own Church forbids the practice.

The next division of the canons is thus headed:— "*Things appertaining to churches.*" The *Bible*, the *Book of Common Prayer*, and the *Book of Homilies*, are to be kept in all churches. A font of stone is to be set up in every church "in the ancient usual place." The situation of the font is settled by this canon; for the usual place was near the entrance, at the west end of the church, as is evident from its position in our old churches, in many of which it still remains on the spot on which it was originally erected. Then the material is to be stone; yet in some churches small movable fonts of wood have been introduced. The situation of the communion-table is not fixed in the canons, but is left to the discretion of the

ordinary, as is the case in the rubric in the communion-service. The words are rather remarkable: "At which time the same shall be placed in so good sort within the church or chancel, as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and administration, and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number may communicate with the said minister." It is also ordered that the ten commandments should be placed on the east end of every church and chapel, and that *other chosen sentences* should be written in convenient places. A pulpit and a chest for alms are also to be provided in every church.

It is not necessary to notice more than the last division of the canons, on *the authority of synods*. A national synod, consisting of the convocations of both provinces, is the only representative of the Anglican Church. To such an assembly it is competent to make alterations, and to no other.

Appended to the canons is the royal *ratification*, or *confirmation*, according to the terms of the Act of Submission. It is remarkable that in this ratification, the king orders the canons to be executed, not only in the province of Canterbury, where they were enacted, but in the province of York also, whose convocation had not given their sanction. This was a strong step on the part of his Majesty; but as the canons were generally approved, it was deemed desirable to assent to them in the province of York. Accordingly, as the convocation could not even treat of canons without the royal permission, his Majesty granted his license for that purpose, as he had already done in Canterbury in the case of the canons which were now published.[n]

[n] The Articles were also subscribed by convocation. "16th session, May 18, 1604. The king's letters, with the Articles 1562 to be by the convocation approved and allowed. The said Articles read and subscribed by both houses, and this booke soe subscribed was kept by the Bishop of London. Pres." Tanner Mss. 282. "27th session, July 9, 1604. King's writt to

The Book of Common Prayer was revised and published in 1604, but it was not submitted to the convocation. James authorised the bishops, after the conference at Hampton Court, to make such alterations as were deemed desirable, and then the book was printed by the authority of the crown. The king addressed a letter to the ecclesiastical commissioners, in which he first recites what was enacted respecting the supremacy; after which he proceeds, "Whereas also by act of parliament it is provided and enacted, that whenever we shall cause to take further order for or concerning any ornament, righte, or ceremony in the book commonly called 'the Book of Common Prayer, &c.,' and our pleasure known therein, either to our commissioners, authorised under our great seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or to the metropolitane of this our realm of England, that then further order should be therein taken accordingly." He then proceeds, "We therefore, understanding that there were in the said booke certeyne thinges which might require some declaration and enlargement by way of explanation; and in that respect having required you our metropolitane, and you the bishops of London and Chichester, and some other of our commissioners, &c., according to the intent and meaning of the said statute, and some other statutes alsoe, and by our supreme authority and prerogative royal, to take some care and payns therein, have received from you the said particular thinges in the said booke declared, and enlarged by way of explanation, made by you our metropolitane, and the rest of our said commissioners, in manner and forme following."[o]

We have here the authority by which the changes in 1604

prorogue the convocation to the 8th of February, 1604. After this the Canons of 1603 were printed and published." Ib.

[o] Some debates occurred in convocation. "17th session, May 23, a debate about the cross in baptism. 24th session. June 13th, 1604. Complaint against a booke printed, called *Limbo Mastix*, rayling against the ecclesiastical function." Tanner Mss. 282.

were made in the Book of Common Prayer. It was at best a questionable authority, and the legitimate method would have been to have submitted the book to the convocation for revision. We are not now affected by the question, indeed, because the Book of Common Prayer in its present form was duly authorised by convocation in 1661 ; and I allude to the subject simply for the purpose of noticing the progress of the Liturgy to its present state. After the above words in the royal letter, or declaration, the various changes are distinctly specified. I shall not quote the exact words of the document, but merely point out what the changes were.

In the absolution *rubric*, the words "or remission of sins" were added ; in the gospel for the second Sunday after Easter, the words "*Christ said*" to be printed in *italics*, or words different from the text ; and the words "to his disciples" omitted. This alteration was made in consequence of the objection raised by the Puritans, who stated that the gospel read, *Jesus said to his disciples*, instead of *Jesus said to the Pharisees*. The bishops on that occasion remarked, that it was uncertain, as both the disciples and Pharisees were present ; and the king, with his usual good sense, suggested that the word *disciples* should be omitted, and the question left undecided. The *rubric* before *private baptism* was altered ; for whereas in the time of Queen Elizabeth and King Edward it was so framed that in cases of necessity any person present might administer the rite, the matter was now settled by the insertion of the words *lawful minister*.[p] Some words were added before the declaration of the use of confirmation ; and the questions and answers on the sacraments were appended to the catechism.

Some few changes were made too in the calendar. To *August* 26 this note was added : "The 13th of Daniel,

[p] "Other expressions in other parts of the service, which seemed before to admit of *lay baptism*, were so turned as expressly to exclude it." Gibson's Codex, 447.

touching the historie of Susanna, is to be read unto theis words 'And king Astiages,' &c." The same day, at evening prayers, the 30th chapter of Proverbs was substituted for the 14th of Daniel concerning Bel and the Dragon. On the *first* of October, instead of the *fifth* chapter of Tobit, a portion of the *sixth* of Exodus was appointed at morning prayer; and in the evening, the 20th of Joshua was substituted for the 6th of Tobit. On the 2d of October, the 22d chapter of Joshua was to be read for the 8th of Tobit; and on the 17th of November, the 46th chapter of Ecclesiasticus was to be read as far as the words "After this he told," &c.

Several prayers and collects were also added. After the prayer for the king, one for the queen and royal family was inserted, and also a petition in the Litany to the same effect. The particular thanksgivings were now added; and these were all the changes made in the book at this time.

After the specification of the changes came the royal confirmation:—"Forasmuch as wee having maturely considered of them, do hold them to be very agreeable to our own several directions, upon conference with you and others, and that they are in no part repugnant to the word of God, nor contrarie to anie thinge that is already contained in that book; nor to any of our laws or statutes made for allowance and confirmation of the same; wee, by virtue of the said statutes, and by our supreme authoritie, doe fully approve, allowe, and ratify all and every one of the said declarations and enlargements by way of explanation."[q]

[q] The proclamation declares that all was done according to law; and the 80th canon seems to give the sanction of convocation to the book. It declares that the book was lately explained "in some few points by his majesty's authority according to the laws and his highness's prerogative." This was a sanction after the alterations were made. "Wherefore our venerable convocation, considering how this booke hath beene allowed by such a world of witnesses, and published by the sovereigne authority of a most learned religious prince, how can they do lesse than commend the use of this booke, and binde all that hereafter shall be admitted either to the ministry, ... by

His Majesty proceeds to authorise the printing of the book by Barker. The document was dated the 9th day of February. The proclamation authorising the book is dated March 5. As soon as the book of 1604 was put forth by authority, the Puritans, who had expected great things from James, began to raise many objections. These were exhibited in works secretly printed, without any name of place or printer, probably at their private press, which was moved from place to place for the purpose of concealment. A singular argument was used against kneeling in the communion, drawn from the rubric relative to the minister's reception of the elements. "What conformitie is there prescribed in the Booke of Common Prayer, when in one and the same church, and in one and the same act of receiving, it permitteth the minister to receive standing, and prescribeth the people to receive kneeling? or what greater reverence is there required by the sheepe than is to be performed by the shepherd? The words of the book for the ministers standing, when he receiveth the communion, seem unto us to be so perspicuous and without all manner of ambiguitie, as without an absurditie they cannot be construed to command a minister to kneele; for the manner how the minister of the place, or how other ministers, if any be present to help him, should receive is not prescribed at all, unless it be prescribed that he and they should receive standing." But they proceed still further, and argue that even the people need not kneel, though they had previously complained of this very act. After quoting the rubric, they say, "never-

their several subscriptions, to approve the same?" Mason on the Authority of the Church, pp. 22, 23. It is clear, though James ordered the alterations without consulting the convocation, that they received synodical authority by being sanctioned with the book in the imposing of subscription. "He by his own authority ratified the same without any alterations, except in some few of the rubricks; and they also were so inconsiderable that scarce any in those days could take notice of them, and there are but few, I believe, in this age that know what they were." Beveridge's Defence of the Psalms, pp. 10, 11.

theless it followeth not here upon (the law being not in the negative, but in the affirmative) that the minister may not deliver the communion to the people standing or sitting, or that the people be expressly bound not to stand or to sit, but to kneele." This line of argument is adopted in many of their publications during the reign of James.[r] In short, the argument was commonly used at this period by those who disliked conformity, and were anxious to justify their conduct by the rubrics. It amounted to this, that no posture was prescribed. The question is very curious, and illustrates the principles of interpretation adopted by the Puritans to serve their own cause. Thus, in another remarkable book of the period, we have this question,—"Whether the people bee directed in these words to kneele, seeing it is not to be supposed that the state doeth intend (directlie) to command the people to receive otherwise than the priest. But the priest is expressly directed in the next rubrike before to stand, and not directed to kneele now; whereas in rubrikes after the general confession in the beginning of the communion, he is directed to stand and after to kneel; and in Q. E. he is expressly commanded to kneel at this very time." The argument is based on the omission in Elizabeth's book, and that of 1604, of the interpolated rubric respecting kneeling in Edward's second book. The line of argument shews that they were anxious to retain their churches by evading the law. Thus it was argued that the Act of the 13th of Elizabeth did not tie the people to any posture in the reception of the elements. "So that the meaning of this word 'kneeling' (supposing it were immediately joined with the word 'people') may be this, *To the people, though he find*

[s] Certaine Demands with their grounds drawne out of Holy Writ and propounded *in foro conscientiæ* by some religious gentlemen unto the Reverend Fathers, Richard Archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bishop of London, William Bishop of Lincolne, Garvase Bishop of Worcester, William Bishop of Exeter, and Thomas Bishop of Peterborough: whereunto the said gentlemen require that it please their lordships to make a true, plaine, direct, honest, and resolute answere. 4to, 1605, p. 45.

them kneeling. For by the rubrique next before the general confession in the beginning of the communion, all were set upon their knees. After that, and before the act of receiving, the minister is twise directed to stand. But so are not the people. Therefore this rubrique may be deemed to suppose, but not directly and plainlie to commaund the people now to kneele." Because in King Edward's first book the minister is commanded to kneel at the prayer immediately before receiving the elements, while in subsequent books he is commanded to stand at the prayer of consecration, the Puritans argue: "so that it may be a quære, whether the minister who doth not stand in the act of receiving may not be indicted; and consequently it may be another quære, whether he may not be also lawfully troubled for not ministering the communion to such as do not kneele." In Edward's first book kneeling is not mentioned in the rubric before the administration of the elements; but it is inserted in the second; yet the Puritans argue, that the posture is left indifferent, and that the rubric in the latter at the close of the service only meant that persons might receive kneeling, if they pleased. "For the words bee not *communicants should receive kneeling*, but *communicants kneeling may receive.*"[8]

[8] A Survey of the Booke of Common Prayer, by way of 197 Quæries grounded upon 58 places, &c., 12 mo., anno Domini 1610, pp. 70, 71, 170, 171. This book, like the preceding, was privately printed. In the same volume they say, that "Archbishop Parker (who knew well the intendment of the booke now in use, whereof he was a principal peruser) ministered the communion at Canterbury to the people standing; and her Majesty's commissioners in causes ecclesiastical did, above 58 years ago, establish in Coventry standing in the acte of receiving the elements." "All this being true, who can believe that people are directly and plainlie commanded by the Booke of Common Prayer to kneele in the acte of receiving?" Ib. 198. From this book we gather, that it was a general practice in the reign of Elizabeth not to pronounce the words of distribution to each person when the communicants were numerous. "If the minister omit this prayer (as usually he doth when communicants be many) and not pronounce it for every communicant, then the communicant for whom it is not particularly pronounced is not bound to kneele." Ib. 199, 200. This is a strange argument, since it im-

But the Puritans in the very same books pursued another course, which appears utterly inconsistent with their arguments about the rubrics in the communion-service. They denied the authority of the book.

By the Act of Elizabeth, as was noticed in a previous chapter, it was ordered that the Book of Common Prayer should be provided by the parish; and it was stated that it was the same as King Edward's, save in a few particulars, which were specified. When the book of 1604 was published, the Puritans objected, "it is provided and enacted that the book shall at the costs of the parishioners be attayned and gotten. From whence it seemeth to follow (the minister not being commanded to attayn and get the said booke), if the parishioners have not hitherto attayned and gotten the said booke, that the minister is not bound to use the said service." Then they proceed to argue, that the book had not been procured, because it was not the

plies, even on their own principle, that persons were bound to kneel when the words were pronounced to each individual. They pretend that in most parishes, "where a constant faithful ministry hath continued, kneeling hath been indifferently used, and (till by the late canons that liberty was abridged) because all or most professors as they profited in the knowledge of the Gospel, so they grew into dislike of kneeling." Ib. 201. They add: "As for these few cathedral churches, it may be said, that that popish trash is fit for such high places. And it may be concluded, that if wafers and altars are lawful in them, because they are not forbidden, then a gesture sacramentally fit for a sacramental eating is no lesse lawful in parish churches, because it is not forbidden." Thus it is asserted that wafers were used and altars erected in some few cathedral churches. "Will the objector account either those fewe cathedral churches schismaticall, who administer the communion with wafers and at altars, otherwise than doe many cathedral, and all parish churches?" Ib. 202, 203. They had previously argued that wafers were not prohibited, because the rubric said, "it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usually eaten." Ib. 177. It is stated in this work that wafers were used at that time in Westminster Abbey. Ib. 81. The inconsistency of the Puritans in denying at one time what they asserted at another is proved by their works. In the admonition to the parliament in the year 1571 or 1572, kneeling at the communion is said to be commanded by the rubric; and the position is maintained by Cartwright in the whole of his controversy with Whitgift; yet in later times the Puritans pretended that the practice was left indifferent. Whitgift's Answere to the Admonition, pp. 179, 180.

same as Elizabeth's. "That the parishioners have not hitherto attayned and gotten the said book seemeth to be manifest upon these considerations. The booke which the minister is bound to use should differ from the Booke of Common Prayer authorised by act of parliament 5 and 6 Edward VI. but in four points." The particulars are then mentioned, as we have already given them. They proceed: "But in the booke attayned and gotten there be moe alterations than are specified in the statute." The alterations are then given.[t] The same argument is adopted

[t] Certaine Considerations drawne from the Canons of the last Synod and other the king's ecclesiastical and statute law, *ad informandum animum Domini Episcopi Wigornensis, seu alterius cujusque judicis ecclesiastici ne temere et inconsulto prosiliant ad deprivationem ministrorum ecclesiæ;* for non-subscription, for the not exact use of the order and forme of the Booke of Common Prayer, heretofore provided by the parishioners of any such parish church within the diocese of Worcester, or for the not precise practice of the rites, ceremonies, and ornaments of the church. 4to, 1605, p. 7. This and the "Certaine Demands" were printed by the same press, as is evident from the type and the borders of the titles. In Elizabeth's reign the Puritans had a movable press; and doubtless they proceeded in a similar way in the reign of James. We find the same line adopted in other works. "Sure we are that the booke allowed by the statute ought to differ from the booke authorised in the 5 and 6 years of Edward VI. but in four pointes. If they shall be able to prove that the book now pressed is none other than that, then let them say they have some colour of law for their purpose; but if it be manifest that the new booke differs from that in many more points, then let Mai. H. for shame cease to beguile the reader by referring him to a statute, when as indeed that statute is so far from injoining the booke now in use, that it maketh us liable to an indictment and imprisonment if so be we shall use the same." The Removal of Certaine Imputations laid upon the Ministers of Devon and Cornwall, 4to, 1606, p. 42. This also was privately printed, consequently no name either of the place or the printer occurs. The pressing of conformity after James's accession was complained of in a large number of anonymous and privately-printed books. In 1604 the archbishop addressed a letter to the bishops to press subscription according to the canon. The various works to which we have referred shew that great irregularity had prevailed for years. "The ceremonies," say the Puritans, "have growne to such disuse in very many churches (in some 20 yeares, in some 30, in some more), that it would be a very strange thing, and therefore very scandalous, to bring them into use again." A Short Dialogue, proving that the Ceremonies, &c. are defended by none other arguments than such as the Papists have used, &c. 4to, printed 1605, p. 55. This writer also denies that the

in various works. They contend, that the minister is not bound to get the book, and that the book actually procured is not the book intended by the Act of Uniformity, and that consequently the ministers were not bound to use it.

The authority of the canons also, by which the book was sanctioned, was denied by the Puritans on the ground that they were not unanimously carried in convocation. "Many of the convocation never gave consent to these canons. Yea, some of the bishops never gave consent unto those canons. Yea, one of the bishops hath affirmed in open place that he and two or three more made the canons. It is great pity it were not throughly inquired how the matters were carried in the late convocation, there being some of the bishops themselves who speak very broadly of the matter."[u] So in another work: "The now Archbishop of Canterbury, being then Bishop of London and president of the convocation, had (if not the onely, as many saye yet) the chiefest hand and a negative voice in casting those canons."[v]

book of 1604, or even that of Elizabeth, was the lawful book. "Though the Book of Common Prayer used in the late queen's time require them, yet neither is that the booke which is by law established, differing in many things from King Edward's booke (where it should differ but in three only), as is elsewhere proved." Ib. 56. It was alleged that no book except Edward's could be lawfully used. Survey, &c. 162.

[u] A short Dialogue, &c. pp. 56, 57.

[v] London Petition, at the end of the Survey of the Book of Common Prayer. In the same book the archbishop is called "the chief (if not only) founder of the canons." Some of the reasons against subscription were extraordinary. Thus, "because we have no warrant in the word to say, that children being baptised are undoubtedly saved, as is avouched in the rubrike. This is too much presumption for any man so peremptorily to affirme, for this is to enter into God's secrets." Removal of certain Imputations, &c. Confirmation was objected to on the ground that it had "ascribed to it what is proper to the sacraments." Ib. This is frequently repeated in the works of the period. "The booke giveth to confirmation whatsoever belongs to the nature and essence of a sacrament." An Abridgement of that booke, which the ministers of Lincoln Diocess delivered to his Majesty on the first of December last. 4to, printed 1605, p. 76. This work also was privately printed at the Puritan press. It was said that the answer in the catechism respecting the number of the sacraments implied that "there be mo than two." "It is dangerously implyed, that there are more than two sacraments." London

They complained also of the Report of the Hampton Court Conference, alleging that the king's speeches were not recorded. "Sith the king's own speeches be grossly abused by the author, it is much more likely that speeches of other men are abused. Besides, none but prelats and such as were partial being present at the first day's conference, there can be no credit at all given to the report thereof; for it is more than apparent that they have fraudulently cut off and concealed all the speeches (which were many) that his majesty uttered against the corruptions of our Church and practice of the prelats." They then adopt a new course, asserting that the conference was not desired, but "underhand plotted and procured by the prelats themselves." It is alleged that the ministers who spoke were not of the opinions of the party, and that they were unauthorised. The ministers are charged with refusing to tell the king that some of their brethren were more

Petition in Survey, &c., 120. "We exclude confirmation and matrimony. But in the Book of Common Prayer we destroy ye same againe, when we give such symbolical signification to the cross in baptisme, and affirme that matrimonie signifieth the mystical union," &c. Plea of the Innocent, 199. Another objection is so strange, that it proves that they were resolved to complain. In the book of 1604, the genealogy in Matthew i. and Luke iii. was ordered to be omitted in reading the lessons. To this the Puritans object, alleging that the genealogies were useful to demonstrate Christ to be the promised seed. Abridgement, &c. p. 3. Hutton's Answere to the Reasons, &c., 4to, Oxford, 1605, pp. 19, 23, 28. In the rubric in the communion-office, the confession was ordered to be made "either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers, or by the priest himselfe." To this they object, "that one of the people is allowed to make the confession in the name of the whole." Abridgement, &c. p. 75. "Because it permits some of the communicants to make the publike confession of sins, which only belongs to the minister as his special office." London Petition in the Survey. In this objection even the moderate Puritans concurred. "The first we are taught by the Articles to be contrarie to God's word; because they say no man may minister in the church except he be called." Plea of the Innocent, p. 46. They ask whether it was lawful "for men to sanctify weekly, quarterly, or yearly fasting dayes; seeing it is noted as a part of a Pharisee to fast twise a weeke." Survey, &c. p. 81. Yet these men afterwards, during the war with their sovereign, had their monthly fasts, when the most unchristian sentiments were uttered from their pulpits.

opposed than themselves. Nor do they conceal their wishes for the Book of Discipline. To the charge that they were fond of change, and that they would not rest satisfied even with their own discipline, they reply: "The practice of all other reformed Churches injoying the discipline confuteth this slanderous objection." But the most remarkable thing, perhaps, in the book from which we are quoting is the assertion of judgments on such of their own party as yielded in the matter of conformity. "Some languishing and pining away till they have died, and that within few days after their yielding; some possessed (as it were) with a continual fury, incessantly vexing and tormenting them, and thrusting them into continual storming and raging in the pulpit against those that doe not as they doe, all of them falling to the maintenance of most gross and popish errors."[x] Even Whitgift's attack was a judgment from God, according to these men. They allege that he was so distressed at James's condemnation of the collect for the first Sunday in Lent, "saying it should be reformed, that he presently fell into his palsey, was carried from the court, and died shortly after."[y]

It is remarkable that some of the Puritans, after the publication of the canons of 1604, called upon James either to reform the English Book or to establish the Scottish Liturgy: "either to follow the example of King Edward, who, in the fifth yeare of his reign, reformed the Booke of Common Prayer, which was established by the authority of parliament in the second yeare of his own reign, or to establish the Liturgie which is in Scotland." They prefer the latter course: "This latter is rather to be desired." Alluding to the alleged corruptions in the Book of Common Prayer, they add: "but it is not known that ever any professor of the Gospell excepted any such

[x] A Christian and Modest Offer of a most indifferent Conference, &c. about the main and principal Controversies betwixt the Prelats and the late silenced and deprived Ministers. Imprinted 1606, 4to, pp. 28, 29, 35. Ib. 19.

[y] Survey, &c. 160.

thing against that Liturgie." They very modestly say: "By reason of this book, the English Churches differ from all other reformed Churches; whereas if that Liturgy were established as well in England as in Scotland, there would be a sweet harmony, as with other reformed Churches, so amongst ourselves. Besides, may it not seem a monstrous deformitie, that in one island, under one king, there should be two so different Church policies and liturgies, one derived from and conformable unto the synagogue of Rome, the other derived only from the pure fountains of holy Scripture?" It is evident that nothing could be done with such men; and that the bishops could not avoid pressing conformity even on the principles of the Puritans. Yet, after all, their misgivings are manifest; for they say: "But D. Covel, in his published Epistle to the Earle of Northampton, reporteth that your majesty purposeth to conforme the Churches of Scotland to those in England. But he is thought notably to abuse your majestie. For it is not generally known that your majestie hath, by subscription, sworne to maintaine the discipline and liturgie in Scotland."[z] Thus these men

[z] Survey of the Book, &c. pp. 19, 20, 22. In one of their queries they ask, "whether it be not as lawfull for his majestie, by authoritie only of his proclamation, to bring into the Church the Liturgie of Scotland." Ib. 123. It appears to have been the custom at this time, when the Puritans were examined for non-compliance with the ceremonies, to call in the aid of learned divines. Thus we are told by Tooker, chaplain to James I. in 1604, "I was lately called before a right honourable presense of lords and other of his majestie's councell by commaundment, to satisfie the scrupulous consciences of certaine discontented persons, who proposed many things against the authoritie and government of bishops, but, in fine, would neither oppose nor answer in the doubts which themselves proposed." Tooker's Fabrique of the Church, 12mo, 1604, p. 98. The first edition of the Book of Common Prayer in the reign of James I., A.D. 1604, is now exceedingly rare. Very few copies exist in our public libraries. It was republished in the same size in 1605. This also is a rare edition. I became possessed of the former after inquiries continued for many years, and the existence of the latter edition appears not to have been generally known. I have also a copy of this edition. Occasionally in this work I mention books in my own possession, because it is desirable that the places in which rare volumes exist should be known.

were presumptuous enough not only to reject the Book of Common Prayer, but to ask for the imposition of their own upon persons opposed to its reception far more numerous than themselves, and so dishonest as to assert that no professor of the Gospel objected to the Scottish book; thus denying that almost all the English clergy, whose objections were insuperable, were true professors of Christ's Gospel. This was the very feeling that at length issued in the ruin of the Church and the monarchy, and the production of innumerable evils to the country. We cannot wonder that such unreasonable demands were rejected, or that the men who could make them were subjected to inconvenience for their nonconformity.

It is necessary, in order to a due apprehension of the difficulties of the bishops in dealing with the Puritans, and also of the inconsistent proceedings of the latter, to study the works to which we have now referred, as well as others of a similar character. They are the materials for the history of the period; nor can any one sit down to their perusal, if he is only anxious for the discovery of the truth, without being convinced that the bishops acted on principles far more lenient than those which were advocated by the Puritans.

The parliament, as is well known, was summoned to meet on the 5th of November, 1605. In consequence, however, of the discovery of the Gunpowder Treason, it did not assemble until the 9th. The convocation of Canterbury met on the 6th of November, when Overall was chosen prolocutor of the lower house. A book was laid before the convocation by the archbishop concerning the state of the Church, and both houses were desired to take it into consideration.[a]

[a] Wake's State of the Church, 507; Wilkins, iv. 412. "Jan. 24, 1605. The archbishop delivers a booke drawn up concerning the state of the Church. Desires both houses to take copies, and consult about it." Tanner Mss. 282. "5th session: The archbishop brings in the king's license to make canons. 11th session: The archbishop declares he cannot that day be present, and

In the province of York also the convocation assembled on the 6th of November. Their business was interrupted by the death of the archbishop; but the king, by a new writ, dated January 22d, addressed to the guardian of the spiritualities, commanded them to proceed. In the vacancy of the see, the Bishop of Bristol, as Dean of York, acted as president.[b] They addressed his majesty for a royal commission to treat, conclude, and do such things in convocation as should be for the general good of the province. This request was made in consequence of the canons already published, and, by the king's confirmation, ordered to be executed in the province of York. The canons were not disliked by the bishops and clergy in this province, but they were anxious to maintain their own privileges; for, as they had not concurred in enacting the canons, it was not reasonable to expect them to submit until they had actually sanctioned them in their own convocation. The convocation of Canterbury could not bind the province of York. They wished, by passing the canons in due form, to submit to his majesty, and at the same time to vindicate their own privileges.[c]

The license was therefore granted, according to their request. It was in the usual form; and after it had been communicated to the convocation, the canons of the preceding year, agreed upon in the province of Canterbury, were read, agreed to, and adopted as their own. The decree commences thus:

"Whereas we, the president and clergy of the convocation of the province of York, authorised by his majesty's

therefore by word of mouth substitutes the Bishops of St. David's, Bangor, Llandaffe, Hereford, St. Asaph, commissioners to continue and adjourne. 11th session: 21st Feb. 1605. Lower house called up. One Cartwright appeared, who, having killed a clergyman and obtayned the king's pardon, begged pardon and absolution of the bishops. But not having the king's pardon then, he was dismissed to a further consideration of his petition." Tanner Mss. 282.

[b] Wake's State, 507.

[c] Wake's State, 507; Wilkins, iv. 426-428.

commission, have diligently viewed and deliberately examined the constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated, concluded, and agreed upon by the reverend Father in God, Richard, by God's providence late Bishop of London, president of the convocation for the province of Canterbury, and the rest of the bishops and clergy in the same province, by his majesty's license, in their synod, begun at London A.D. 1603."

It then states that they found that the canons were fit and requisite for the province of York, and that they should be of force, and also be reckoned among their own constitutions and canons. They were accordingly subscribed by all the members; and thus these canons were duly authorised by both convocations.[d]

Much has been said of these canons; some persons even asserting that they have no authority at all; while others have denied that they were canons of the Church. Lord Coke said long since that a convocation could only make canons to bind the clergy; but in ecclesiastical matters, some of them even now concern the laity; or how comes it to pass that they are often enforced in our ecclesiastical courts? In the time of Charles II. it was ruled in the King's Bench that the canons of 1604 were of force, on the ground of the statute of the 25th of Henry VIII., provided they did not impugn the common law or the royal prerogative. The old canon law was part of the law of the land; and by the 25th of Henry VIII. all canons were continued, except such as were prejudicial to the prerogative or the laws of the realm. When, therefore, a canon is within the meaning of the act of the 25th Henry VIII., it is still a part of the common law. So when the convocation make canons within the meaning of that statute, canons which properly belong to their cognisance, and they are confirmed by the crown, they are binding as ecclesiastical laws. There is of course a difference between the canons and the rubrics and articles, since the

[d] Wake's State, 508; and app. 237, 239.

two latter, having been sanctioned by act of parliament, are a part of the statute law of the land. Thus, for instance, in proving wills, and in other similar matters, the canon law is still followed as the common law on the subject. All the canons, therefore, of 1604, which have their foundation in the laws of the land, though not expressly confirmed by any particular act of parliament, are binding on all the queen's subjects as well as the clergy, while others bind ecclesiastics only. The canon law is still in use in our ecclesiastical courts, and obligatory under the restrictions specified in the Act of Submission.[e] It may be observed, that some of the canons are virtually confirmed by the Act of Uniformity. The *rubrics* in the Book of Common Prayer have parliamentary as well as convocational authority. One of the *rubrics* in the communion service directs that the ordinary is to proceed in certain cases according to the canon; and the 35th is specified in a *rubric* in the *baptismal* service as containing the Church's explanation of the use of the sign of the cross. It is therefore folly to pretend that the canons of 1604 have no authority, or that they are not canons of the Church.

Great ignorance has been evinced on this subject, even by persons calling themselves members of the Church of England, who are constantly asserting that the canons of 1604 are of no force. Lord Hardwicke stated that they did not bind the laity *proprio vigore*. His authority has often been appealed to by those who wish to disparage the canons; but they only partially quote his words, and thus propagate a false view of the subject. His words are these: —"We are all of opinion that the canons of 1603, not having been confirmed by parliament, do not *proprio vigore* bind the laity: I say *proprio vigore*, by their own force and

[e] Gibson, 945-947, 954-956; Johnson, i. pref. xxvii.; Ayliffe's Parergon, introduction; Leslie's Case of the Regale, 76; Barlow's Remains, 53; Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, preface.

authority; for there are many provisions contained in these canons which are declaratory of the ancient usage and law of the Church of England, received and allowed here, which in that respect, and by virtue of such ancient allowance, will bind the laity." So that, according to Lord Hardwicke, there are some canons by which the laity are bound. Burn, alluding to Lord Hardwicke's decision, remarks, "It is to be inquired how much of those canons is agreeable to the ancient canon law, and how much is added of new by the convocation of 1603; for in the former case the same will be obligatory both upon the clergy and laity, and in the latter case upon the clergy only." Yet Burn observes, that in the case of proctors and churchwardens, who are laymen, the temporal courts proceed upon a supposition that these canons are in force.[f] It is probable that the parties who object to the canons of 1604 would object still more to the old canon law, part of which is still in force as a portion of the law of the land.

The convocation of Canterbury proceeded with the book already mentioned. This was Overall's Convocation-Book,[g] which was drawn up in consequence of the Gunpowder Treason, and the principles then advocated by many Romanists respecting kings; nor can there be any doubt that it was intended to be regarded as an exposition of the sense of the Anglican Church on the subjects of which it treats. It consists of three parts, though Wake supposes that the portion given in by the archbishop was only the first part of the printed book.[h] Still the matter is very uncertain; nor is there any positive evidence that the whole book was not submitted to the convocation by the archbishop. After the book had been presented, the king's license to treat of canons was granted; and the document was subsequently sanctioned. These particulars

[f] Burn's Preface.

[g] Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book, 1606, concerning the Government of God's Catholic Church, and the Kingdoms of the whole World. London, 1690.

[h] Wake's State, 618.

are stated in the advertisement prefixed to the volume in 1690:

"The three following books are published from a copy carefully and faithfully transcribed from the original MS., which was Bishop Overall's, and drawn up by him, after whose decease it came into the possession of Dr. John Cosin, some time his secretary, who bequeathed it to the public library by him founded at Duresm. The first of these three books was also heedfully compared, and in some casual defects supplied from another MS., which, from the attestation of Archbishop Bancroft at the end thereof, seems to have been the original, that then passed the upper house of convocation; and after his decease it came to his successors, the archbishops of Canterbury, and among them to Archbishop Laud, as appears under his own handwriting in the last page of it. In the first and second of these books there were several amendments made by the upper house: all placed at the end of Bishop Overall's MS., and according to such amendments, inserted in their proper places, is the following book printed."[i]

At the end of the *first* book are the following words: "The said thirty-six chapters, with the constitutions made upon them, have passed, with one consent, both the convocation houses, and so are approved.

"*R. Cant.*"

The consent of the province of York also follows. "The said thirty-six chapters, with the constitutions made upon them, have been diligently read and deliberately examined; and hereupon have likewise passed, with one consent, in the convocation-house of the province of York.

"Jo. Bristol, *Præses Convocat. Eborac.*"

[i] Overall's Convocation-Book. King James objected to some of the principles in the book, consequently it was never sanctioned. His objections were stated in a letter to Abbot. Welwood supposes that the convocation was called to relieve James of his doubts relative to the Dutch and their allegiance to Spain. He disapproved of their conduct in troubling themselves about such matters. Welwood, 31-34; Wilkins, iv. 405.

The first book, therefore, was sanctioned by the upper and lower houses in the province of Canterbury, and also by the convocation of York. In short, it received the full sanction of the Anglican Church.

At the close of the other books is the following: "*Hæc omnia superscripta ter lecta sunt in domo inferiori convocationis in frequenti synodo cleri, et unanimi consensu comprobata.*

"*Ita testor,* JOHANNES OVERALL, *prolocutor.*"

Though sanctioned by the Church, the book possesses no authority, inasmuch as it was not confirmed by his majesty, who, disliking some of the sentiments, requested that it might not be presented to him for confirmation. Its views, however, may still be regarded as those of the Anglican Church, since they were solemnly confirmed in convocation, and have never been repealed.[j]

There are some very important statements in this volume. The three creeds are affirmed as containing a summary of Christian truth; while the creed of Pope Pius IV. is repudiated. Thus in the second book the following pointed passage occurs: "In which *creeds,* containing the Catholic faith, in those days, or in any of the rest, we have thought it good here to remember, that there is not any one article to warrant or prove those new articles, which were coined long after the making of any of the said *creeds,* by the bishops of Rome, and are added to the *Nicene Creed* by Pius IV., in the professing of the Roman faith."[k] The *eleventh* chapter of the second book has this title: "That there is no more necessity of one visible head of the Catholic Church than of one visible monarch over all the world."[l] The following passages are important: "It is

[j] It was read in convocation, and intended to be published against "A Conference about the next Succession to the Crown," by Parsons, under the name of Doleman. Winwood, i. 51; Burnet, an. 1698. The book, as will be shewn in a subsequent chapter, was published by Sancroft.

[k] Overall's Convocation-Book, p. 101.

[l] Ibid. 217.

certain and manifest, that as the Catholic Church is resembled in the Scriptures to an host well ordered, to a human body, to a kingdom, to a flock of sheep, to an house, and to a ship; so Christ only is intended thereby to be her only general, her only head, her only king, her only shepherd, her only householder, her only pilot. Neither can any other thing be enforced from the words mentioned of one faith and one baptism, but that as we are only justified through a lively faith in Christ, so there is but one baptism ordained, whereby we have our first entrance into his spiritual kingdom, and are made particular members of his Catholic Church."[m] The last book comprehends a sketch of the papal usurpations until the power of the pope was fully established. In short, the whole volume is full of interest, and especially at the present time, when the faith of some of the members of our Anglican Church is perverted by Romish sophistry.

At this period all the sound divines of the English Church met their Romish opponents on the ground assumed in the canon cited from the convocation of 1606. Jewell's challenge is well known. He offered to conform to the Church of Rome if it could be proved that her peculiar doctrines were held during the first six centuries. On this ground did all the great men of the time of Elizabeth and James I. take their stand. "When the fathers do all agree, we do not dislike them; and for the first fower generall councels, we allow and approve them."[n] But the peculiarities of popery were rejected, because they were unsupported by Scripture and antiquity. "Which as they are not found in the Scriptures, so are they repugnant as well to the fathers as to all the aforesaid general councels."[o] It was a common challenge in these times, to offer to conform to the Romish Church, if her advocates could prove that her peculiar doctrines were held by the Church

[m] Overall's Convocation-Book, p. 253.
[n] Bancroft's Sermon, 1588, p. 36 [o] Ibid.

during the first five centuries. Illustrations of this position are numerous in the writings of the period. One may be given as an example, taken from the works of a man who was even suspected by the Puritans of a leaning towards Rome, and who certainly on some points entertained extreme opinions. But the instance will shew how well qualified the men of that day were to meet their Romish adversaries. "If any Papist living can prove that the present Roman Church is eyther the Catholique Church, or a sound member of the Catholique Church—that the present Church of England is not a true member of the Catholique Church—or that all those points, or that any one of those points, which the Church of Rome maintaineth against the Church of England, were or was the perpetual doctrine of the Catholique Church, the concluded doctrine of the representative Church in any general council, or the dogmatical resolution approved of any one father for 500 yeares after Christ,—I will subscribe. Bring me any one place of Scripture, any practice resolved of the Catholicks, any decision of the Church representative, any determination of the Church collective in a particular approved synod,—any saying of any one father of credit dogmatically resolved for 500 yeares and better after Christ against any thing established in the Church of England, that is, in the Communion Booke, the Booke of Articles, the Booke of Consecrating Bishops and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, —and I will subscribe."[p]

Overall's book was the great business of the convoca-

[p] Montagu's Gag for the New Gospell, &c. London, 1624; preface, and page 328. This same course is taken by Bishop Morton in his most valuable work, "A Catholike Appeale," folio, 1609, and in many other productions of the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. Archbishop Laud argues on the same principle in his "Conference with Fisher;" and the divines of the English Church who resisted the inroads of popery in the reign of Charles II., and especially at the period just before the Revolution, when the sovereign was a member of the Church of Rome, asserted and proved by overwhelming arguments the novelty of the peculiar doctrines of popery, and the scriptural character and antiquity of those of the Church of England.

tion during the year 1606. Other matters, indeed, were discussed, but nothing else was formally concluded.[q] The convocation was continued by various prorogations until February 1609.[r] At this time it was assembled; and Crashaw, a clergyman, was convened before the upper house for the publication of an erroneous book. He was dismissed upon his retractation.[s] In the province of York the grant of the usual subsidy was the only business transacted during several years.[t]

We pass on to the year 1614, when the convocation assembled in both provinces on the 6th of April. In Canterbury a charge of blasphemy was preferred against an individual, who, however, was discharged on his recantation. In York nothing was transacted. The convocation and parliament were dissolved the same year.[u]

The next meeting of convocation was in the year 1620. In the upper house, in the province of Canterbury, a schedule of persons who had neglected the canons of 1604 was presented; and this was almost the only business. In York nothing, except the subsidy, appears to have been

[q] The archbishop declared the "king's pleasure for singing and organ service in cathedrals. 14th session, Feb. 27, 1606. The archbishop produces a booke written in folio (of what subject not mentioned). Causes his secretary to read some leaves. Adjourned." Tanner Mss. 282.

[r] Wake's State of Church, 510; Authority of Christian Princes, 142; Wilkins, iv. 437. York met in 1606, and was continued to 1607, again to 1608. Wilkins, iv. 429, 433, 437.

[s] The book was "News from Italy of a second Moses, by William Crashaw, B.D." Wilkins, iv. 439, 440. Morton, subsequently Bishop of Durham, preached the sermon at the opening of this convocation. He was designed for prolocutor, "but that in modesty he declined it." Life of Bishop Morton by Barwick, 4to, 1660, p. 73.

[t] Wake's State, 510; Wilkins, iv. 444.

[u] Wake's State, 510; Wilkins, iv. 445. Morton was prolocutor of the convocation of Canterbury this year. A most important rule was adopted at this time relative to the election of proctors. None were eligible who did not reside on their cures; neither could the clergy vote for representatives unless they were weekly exercising their ministry. Wilkins, iv. 438.

attempted. This convocation was dissolved in February 1621.[v]

King James summoned his last parliament to meet in February 1623, at which time the convocation was also assembled. A curious complaint was made by the College of Physicians to the upper house of Canterbury respecting some of the clergy, who appear to have exercised the practice of physic. The archbishop replied, that they should be inhibited, except in their own parishes and for purposes of charity.[w] A subsidy was granted in both pro-

[v] Wilkins, iv. 461.

[w] At this time the Dean of Chester was involved in a suit at law, and the convocation of York interfered in his behalf. In the schedule the act of Henry VI. securing the members from arrest was recited, and it is stated that the dean was prevented from his attendance in the convocation of York. It is further stated, that on his petition they had searched the records, and found that he had been present by his proctor on the 13th of February last. All persons are then charged not to molest him, on pain of being brought before the convocation for punishment. Wilkins, iv. 468. In the year 1624 some discussion took place respecting the examination of theological books. The prolocutor proposed the appointment by authority of convocation of persons from the two Universities to undertake the examination of such Mss. and works, or editions of the fathers, councils, and other Greek and Latin writers, as might be found in public libraries, with a special reference to the exposure of the papal frauds. The proposal was adopted, and letters were ordered to be sent to the Archbishop of York and his synod for their consent. Wilkins, iv. 469. After Bancroft's death, the Puritans were not so pressed on the point of subscription by his successor Abbot, who was elevated to Canterbury in 1610. Yet it is remarkable that his elevation was at the time regarded as unfavourable to their hopes. "Especiallie if Dr. Abbot prove Archbishop of Canterburie, according to D. Bancrofte (ready to die), his mind signified (as is reported) to his majesty by Dumbar, an earnest solicitor in his behalfe. And if D. Neale (one of the abusers of the king's eare in sermon time), or D. Barlowe or D. Harsnet be Bishop of London." A Survey of the Book of Common Prayer, preface. A singular statement is made in this preface respecting the Plea of the Innocent. It was printed in 1602, and is a plea for the Puritans supposed to be innocent. In the preface of the Survey it is stated that the Plea of the Innocent was printed in Scotland. "May we not hope that his Majestie will restraine the remnant of this rage? Seeing it pleased him under his hand to allowe their apologie, called *The Plea of the Innocents*, to be printed not long before he came out of Scotland." The author of the Survey complains that the books

vinces. After several prorogations, the convocation was dissolved by the death of the king, A.D. 1625.[x]

of the Puritans are not read; that they were lying "on heaps for want of sale;" and he endeavours to check the curiosity experienced relative to the writers. "It were well if they did not hurt by their curious hearkening after and idle talke of supposed authors and publishers." Preface.

[x] Wilkins, iv. 467, 468. The extracts in the preceding pages from some of the publications of the early period of the reign of James I. shew that the Puritans complained of their leaders at the Hampton Court Conference. It has also been the custom ever since to object to Barlow's Account as a partial performance; yet there is no material difference between his statements and those which were put forth at the time by the Puritans themselves. The truth is, the Puritans were beaten in argument. A curious letter from Rainolds exists, in which he denies that he ever said that the cap and surplice were indifferent things. Gibson Mss. vol. i. no. 121.

CHAPTER IX.

A.D. 1625-1660.

Charles I. — Convocation, 1625, 1626, 1627, 1628 — Articles, 1628 — Convocation, 1640 — Its sessions — Parliament dissolved — Convocation continued — They proceed to business — New writ — Opinions of the Judges on its legality — Canons discussed — Visitations — Canons completed and confirmed — Convocation dissolved — The Canons printed — Examination of the Canons — Other business — Canons opposed — Their authority — New Parliament and Convocation — Canons condemned in Parliament — Alterations in the Book of Common Prayer during the reign of Charles I. — Charges against Laud — Irish Convocation.

THE convocation met, with the parliament, soon after the accession of Charles I., first in London, and then by adjournment in Oxford.[a] In neither province, however, was any business of importance undertaken, beyond the grant of the usual subsidies to the crown. The parliament had been adjourned to Oxford in consequence of the plague, which raged in London at that time; and the convocation was removed thither from the same cause. It appears that they met in the chapel of Merton College. The prolocutor absented himself altogether through fear of the infection, and another individual was appointed to act in his place. Dr. James, so well known by his valuable work on the corruptions of the text of the fathers, moved that all the *manuscript* copies of the fathers in the Universities and in other libraries should be perused, in order that the passages which had been corrupted in the Romish editions might be faithfully published. No proceedings were

[a] "7th session: Aug. 2, 1625, at Christ Church, Oxon. Archbishop present. Adjourned to the 5th instant, at Merton College Chapel. 8th session: Aug. 5, 1625, at Merton College Chapel, Oxford. Adjourned to 12th instant, in the same place." Tanner Mss. 282.

adopted in consequence of the motion.[b] The convocation assembled again in February 1626; but in neither province was any thing material transacted. The case of Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, was debated. He had asserted the *real presence* in a sermon. In Laud's *Diary* we meet with the following notice under the 29th of March: —"In the convocation held that day there was much debating concerning the sermon which Gabriel Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, had preached before the king on the Sunday preceding, being the fifth Sunday of Lent."[c] The convocation was dissolved in June the same year.[d]

The convocation was assembled in 1627; but without entering upon any important business. In the House of Commons many discussions took place on religion, and certain books were censured; but the convocation sat still. It was dissolved the next year.[e] No parliament was summoned between the years 1628 and 1640; consequently the convocation was not called together for many years.[f]

In the year 1628 a new edition of the Thirty-nine Articles was published, to which was prefixed the Royal Declaration. Previous to this period the Articles stood alone. Many years after its publication, a controversy

[b] Comp. Hist. iii. 30, 31; Wake's State, 513, 514; Fuller, xi. p. 108; Wilkins, iv. 469. Kennet says they did not ask for a license.

[c] Comp. Hist. iii. 34; Heylin's Laud, 153; Wharton, i. 31.

[d] Wake's State, 514; Wilkins, iv. 471. It was discussed at York whether proctors could nominate proxies. Ib.

[e] Wilkins, iv. 473. In 1628 a subsidy was granted in both provinces. Ib. 476. Kennet, alluding to the complaints of the Commons about men and books, says: "But the principle and practice were then fixed that a convocation began no debates in religion without instructions from the bishops an a license from the king." Kennet's Comp. Hist. iii. 56. This year the under-sheriff of the county of Hereford was summoned before the House of Lords, on the petition of the lower house of convocation, for having arrested the servant of one of their members. The under-sheriff was ordered by the lords "to submit himself to the lower house of convocation." Grey's Examination of Neal, vol. ii. 225, 226.

[f] Wake's State, 514.

arose respecting the authorship of this declaration; for though all contemporary authorities assigned it to Charles I., yet, in consequence of a mistake by Nichols, the author of *The Confessional*, in the last century, contended that it was the work of James I. Blackburne, the author of *The Confessional*, is not to be trusted in any matter connected with editions of books. In this instance he contended for his position with inconceivable rashness against evidence of the most overwhelming character. Wren, in his Visitation Articles, gives it to Charles I.; and Prynne and Heylin, who were contemporaries of the king, distinctly assure us that it was the work of that sovereign. Duppa, in the year 1629, the year after its publication, mentions it in his Visitation Articles as put forth by Charles I.; and, moreover, it is not to be found in any edition previous to the year 1628. In the preceding edition, published in 1624, the declaration does not exist. The author of *The Confessional*, however, did not take the trouble to examine editions of books. He had made an assertion, and would not retract it, though the evidence against him was conclusive. In the year 1773, Winchester, in his appendix to *A Dissertation on the XVIIth Article*, collected the evidence on this subject, citing the authority of Hammond, Prynne, Laud, Heylin, Pearson, Plaifaire, Rushworth, Bingham, Kennet, Sparrow, and others. A collection of extracts from these authorities had been prepared by Winchester for Ridley, who gave them in one of his letters to the author of *The Confessional;* and yet, notwithstanding this evidence, that writer chose to persist in his strange assertion that the declaration was the production of James I. In consequence of this extraordinary conduct, Winchester was induced to publish the evidence at greater length in the appendix to his own tract.

These particulars prove that such men as Blackburne were careless about evidence in these matters; and they shew also that the knowledge of the various editions of books was at that time very defective. As copies of the

editions of 1624 and 1628 are now to be found in all our public libraries, as well as in many private collections, they must have been still more numerous at that time; and yet Blackburne either declined to take the trouble to examine them, or chose to persist in his assertion in spite of the evidence to the contrary. It is remarkable that a controversy should have existed on such a question; a question which any man of ordinary reading could have decided by a reference to the editions of the Articles themselves, as well as to contemporary writers. One of the charges against Laud was, that he had induced Charles I. to put forth this declaration in order to check the progress of Calvinistic opinions. Nichols left his *Commentary on the Articles* in Ms. By some mistake, when the work was published, James I. was mentioned as the author of the declaration; Gibson copied the error from Nichols; and hence the confident assertion of Blackburne. Besides the contemporary evidence collected by Winchester, there are various other works of the period in which the declaration is mentioned as the work of Charles I. It is assigned to him in the *Newes from Ipswich* in 1636, and by Heylin and Dow in their respective answers to Burton in 1637.[g] The question is really of no importance except as shewing the necessity of examining original works, and of not being content with the statements of other writers. Blackburne affords a singular instance of rashness of assertion in this matter; for he positively declares that the words *now* and *already* in editions subsequent to the Act of Uniformity were forgeries; and he makes his assertion on the authority of Heylin, who, in his life of Laud, by some mistake had

[g] Newes from Ipswich, 1636; Heylin's Answere, &c. 1637, 4to, pp. 45, 179; Dow's Answere, 1637, 4to, p. 38; Duppa's Visitation Articles, 1629; A Dissertation on the XVIIth Article, &c., to which is subjoined a short Tract ascertaining the reign and time in which the Royal Declaration before the XXXIX. Articles was first published: Oxford, 1773, 8vo. In 1803 Winchester's tract was so rare that Archdeacon Churton republished it, with a life of the author. In the introduction it is said that the work was then "known to very few, and not procurable for money."

omitted them. Yet they are to be found in the original in 1628, and in all other editions previous to the Restoration; the last having been published in 1642.

In 1640 the parliament met on the 13th of April, and was dissolved on the 5th of May following. The convocation of Canterbury assembled on the 14th of April. Laud proceeded in his barge from Lambeth, and was received by the usual officers at Paul's wharf, who accompanied him to the north door of St. Paul's church, where he was met by the canons. The service being ended, the usual sermon was preached, after which the clergy accompanied the archbishop and bishops to the chapter-house. The writ of summons was read, and the archbishop recommended the lower house to choose their prolocutor. Stewart, dean of Chichester, was selected for the post; when the convocation was prorogued to the 17th of April, to meet at St. Peter's, Westminster.[h]

On the appointed day, April 17th, they met in their second session in Henry VII.'s chapel. The prolocutor was presented, and confirmed in his office by the archbishop and bishops. Fuller, who was present, remarks that "the Archbishop of Canterbury entertained them with a Latin speech well nigh three quarters of an hour, gravely uttered, his eyes oft-times being but one remove from weeping. It consisted most of generals, bemoaning the distempers of the Church."[i] The archbishop produced the king's letters authorising the convocation to proceed to treat of canons and constitutions. As usual, the Act of Submission was recited in the document, and the following words occur:—"and agree upon the exposition or alteration of any canon or canons now in force, and of and upon such other canons, orders, ordinances, and constitutions, as they shall think necessary. And further, to confer, debate, treat, consider, consult, and agree of and upon such other

[h] Nalson's Collections, i. 357; Heylin's Laud, 422, 423; Syn. Ang. 13, 14; Fuller, xi. 167; Wilkins, iv. 532.

[i] B. ix. 168.

points, matters, causes, and things as we from time to time shall deliver, or cause to be delivered, to the said lord Archbishop of Canterbury." After the reading of this document, the lower house being desired to consider of a subsidy, the convocation was prorogued to the 22d of April.[j]

On the 22d accordingly they met in their third session, when, in consequence of the unsettled state of the country, it was agreed that the Bishops of London, Lichfield and Coventry, St. Asaph's, Hereford, Bangor, Rochester, and Peterborough, should be excused their attendance in convocation, in order that they might be present in parliament. The archbishop pressed upon the convocation the state of his majesty's affairs, and both houses agreed to grant six subsidies. It was further intimated to the lower house, that they had agreed upon the heads of two of the canons relating to Jesuits and other Romanists. These were delivered to the prolocutor, with a charge that no member should give copies. Heylin remarks, that Laud, considering that it would redound to his credit if such canons should emanate from himself, recalled the paper, and, after some consideration, returned it to the lower house, who passed it in the same words.[k]

They assembled again on the 24th of April, when they were adjourned until the next day. *A form of prayer* for God's blessing on the parliament, which had been composed by Mr. Bray and Mr. Oliver, was presented to the bishops, by whom it was approved, and ordered to be used in convocation immediately before the benediction.[l] While the canon against popery was under review, another for the observation of the day of his majesty's accession was offered to the lower house; and also one against socinianism, and a fourth against sectaries. It was ordered that

[j] Nalson, i. 360, 361; Heylin's Laud, 423. The commission was to expire with the parliament.

[k] Heylin's Laud, 425; Collier, ii. 792; Comp. Hist. iii. 109.

[l] Nalson, i. 363; Comp. Hist. iii. 109; Syn. Ang. 23, 27.

none of the members should take private notes of the proceedings. "Whereby the particular passages thereof are left at great uncertainty. However, as far as I can remember, I will faithfully relate, being comforted with this consideration, that he is accounted an impartial arbitrator who displeaseth both sides."[m]

The parliament was suddenly dissolved on the 5th of May, while the canons just mentioned were under consideration. "Possibly," says Collier, "this ecclesiastical assembly had broken up the next day, according to customary practice, if one of the lower house had not acquainted the archbishop with a precedent of Queen Elizabeth's to encourage them to continue their session."[n] Heylin also remarks that the convocation was adjourned, "to the great amazement of many of the members of it, who expected to have been dissolved when the parliament was, according to that clause in the commission aforesaid, by which it was restrained to the time of the parliament only."[o] It was argued that they might continue until they were dissolved by the king's writ; an argument which satisfied some of the members, though, as Heylin remarks, the commission restrained their sessions to the time of the parliament.[p]

Some of the members protested against the continuance after the parliament. According to Fuller, Brownrigg, Hacket, and Holdsworth, and others, to the number of thirty-six, were among the protestors, "thinking it omi-

[m] Fuller, xi. 167 ; Heylin's Laud, 427, 428 ; Collier, ii. 792.

[n] Collier, ii. 792. Fuller, speaking of the dissolution, says: "Whilst the immediate cause hereof is commonly cast on the king and court, the more conscientious look higher and remoter, in the crying sins of our kingdom. And from this very time did God begin to gather the twigs of that rod (a civil war) wherewith soon after he intended to whip a wanton nation." Fuller, xi. 168.

[o] Heylin's Laud, 429 ; Comp. Hist. iii. 101 ; Heylin's Examen, 129.

[p] Wake's State, 515 ; Fuller's Appeal, part iii. 33. The person who mentioned the precedent was Heylin, who stated the particulars to Laud. Most of the propositions submitted to convocation were drawn up by Heylin. Vernon's Life of Heylin, 98 ; Barnard's Life, &c. 179.

nous and without precedent, that the one should survive when the other was expired."[q] Heylin, however, who, as well as Fuller, was present, states that no protestation was heard by him, and that nothing was reduced to writing. Fuller replies, that such was the case, and he appeals to some of the parties, who were living at the time of his controversy with Heylin. In all probability the persons of whom Fuller speaks were fearful of the consequences of such a step.[r]

That scruples were entertained is certain, and therefore Laud acquainted the king with the circumstance, who immediately submitted the case to the judges. Their opinion was contained in the following paper:—

"The convocation being called by the king's writ under the great seal, doth continue until it be dissolved by writ or commission under the great seal, notwithstanding the parliament be dissolved.

John Finch, C.S. Robert Heath.
H. Manchester. Edward Littleton.
John Brampston. John Banks."[s]
Ralph Whitfield.

This decision was communicated to the convocation on the 13th of May. Fuller says that the *thirty-six* protesting members did not separate themselves, "or enter any act *in scriptis;* the rather because they hoped to moderate proceedings by their presence. Thus was an old convocation converted into a new synod; and now their disjoynted meeting being set together again, they betook themselves to consult about new canons." It is clear, therefore,

[q] Fuller, xi. 168.

[r] Fuller's Appeal of Injured Innocence, part iii. 35; Comp. Hist. iii. 101. Heylin says, that, contrary to the general expectation, "instead of hearing some news of his majestie's writ for their dissolution, there came an order from the archbishop to the prolocutor to adjourn till Saturday." Examen, 229.

[s] Nalson, i. 364; Syn. Ang. 33; Heylin's Laud, 429, 430; Collier, ii. 92; Comp. Hist. iii. 110: Wharton's History, &c. i. 80.

that the objectors contented themselves with their protest, however given.[t]

But as the first writ or commission terminated with the parliament, a new one was issued, dated May 12th, 1640, similar to the former, with the exception of a clause repealing the old commission, and continuing the convocation *during pleasure*, instead of *during the present parliament*.[u] This new commission was produced by the archbishop to the convocation on the same day with the decision of the judges.

The convocation of York had met on the same day as that of Canterbury; but the king's license to treat of canons was not exhibited until the 5th of May, the day of the dissolution of the parliament. Another license, dated the 20th of May, was therefore sent, by virtue of which they continued to sit.

On the 15th of May, the secretary of state, Sir Henry Vane, communicated to the convocation a royal message to this effect: that it had been debated in the privy council whether the convocation should proceed to make canons on the ground of his majesty's commission, and that it had been decided in the affirmative. He added, that he was sent by his majesty to exhort them to make such canons as the present exigency required.[w] The next day the prolocutor presented certain heads of canons agreed upon by the lower house. A benevolence was also voted by both houses. On the 18th of May a letter was read from his majesty, in which he commanded them to prepare a canon against the growth of popery, and against heretical and schismatical opinions; and further, that they should agree upon an oath to be taken on admission to holy orders.[x]

[t] Fuller, xi. 169.

[u] Heylin's Laud, 430; Collier, ii. 792; Fuller's Appeal, part iii. 34; Wake's State, 515; Comp. Hist. iii. 110; Heylin's Observator rescued, 262-265.

[v] Wake's State, 515.

[w] Nalson, i. 365; Syn. Ang. 34, 35; Comp. Hist. iii. 110.

[x] Nalson, i. 366, 367; Syn. Ang. 35, 36, 38; Comp. Hist. iii. 110.

In another session certain alterations were made in the canon concerning recusants. The canons relating to the supremacy and the Socinians were also considered. They were at length agreed upon by the upper, and sent down to the lower house. The canons respecting rites and ceremonies were debated by the bishops, and also those which related to the sacrament of the Lord's supper and the situation of the communion-table. During the debate, the Bishop of Gloucester intimated that he should not give his consent to any canons set forth by the present convocation, unless some ancient precedent could be produced.[y]

In the twenty-first session the Book of Articles for Parochial Visitations was discussed, and committed for examination to the Bishops of Exeter and Oxford.[z] On the 27th of May, in their twenty-third session, the archbishop, after stating his majesty's acceptance of their benevolence, communicated to the convocation that the canons agreed upon had been approved by the king and the council unanimously and without hesitation. A public notary then presented a schedule of the titles of all the canons, which was confirmed by the archbishop and bishops.[a]

The last session took place on the 29th of May. After prayers, the canons, seventeen in number, were signed by all the bishops except Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, and also by all the members of the lower house. Heylin informs us that all the members signed according to seniority, "every man's heart going together with his hand, as it is to be presumed from all men of that holy profes-

[y] Nalson, i. 369, 370; Syn. Ang. 40, 41, 44, 45.

[z] Heylin suggested the Book of Articles for visitations, and was desired to compile it. Vernon's Life of Heylin, 98-106; Barnard's Life, &c. 179-182. They were passed and published. Heylin says they were "first published for the visitation of the Bishop of London, and by him fitted in some points for the use of that diocese." Heylin's Laud, 441; Rushworth, part ii. vol. ii. 1186-1188; Gibson's Codex, 962.

[a] Nalson, i. 370, 371; Syn. Ang. 48, 49; Heylin's Laud, 436, 437.

sion."[b] Goodman fearing suspension, at length set his hand to the book. On being asked whether he had signed it *ex animo* and without mental reservation, he replied that he had subscribed, and that he would give no other answer. Laud told him that he must be a Papist, a Socinian, or a sectary. In consequence of his refusal he was suspended; but subsequently he joined the Church of Rome, and died in her communion.[c] Laud told the members that "the king was so far from popery, that there was no man in England more ready to be a martyr for our religion than his majesty." The convocation was then dissolved in the usual form.[d]

Soon after, the canons were published, having been confirmed by royal authority. They had been sent down to York, after their confirmation in the province of Canterbury, and were approved without any hesitation.[e] "The acts whereof, being transmitted unto York, were, by the convocation of that province, perused, debated, and approved without any disputing; and so presented to his majesty, with their names subscribed, according to the ancient custom."[f]

Prefixed to the book is the royal license, which states that, by letters patent dated the 15th of April and again

[b] Heylin's Laud, 418.

[c] Nalson, i. 371, 372. "Which proved true," says Nalson, "for he died a Papist." Yet Goodman declared that his objections arose from another cause. Ib.

[d] Ibid. i. 373; Comp. Hist. iii. 111.

[e] Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Presidents of the Convocations for the respective Provinces of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergie of those Provinces; and agreed upon with the King's Majestie's licence, in their several Synods begun at London and York, 1610. London, 1640. Wilkins, iv. 538-552.

[f] Heylin's Laud, 447. "Soon after," says Fuller, "the same canons were subscribed at York, where the convocation is but the *hand* of the *dial*, moving or pointing as directed by the clock of the province of Canterbury." Fuller, xi. 171; Wilkins, iv. 553. "It was the interest of the covenanting Scots, and all their well-wishers in England, to raise objections and clamours against 'hese new canons." Comp. Hist. iii. 111.

on the 12th of May for the province of Canterbury, and by similar letters dated the 27th of April and the 20th of May for the province of York, his majesty had authorised the convocation to treat of canons and constitutions. It then states that both provinces had met, and agreed upon certain canons, which had been presented to his majesty, according to the statute of the 25th of Henry VIII.

Some notice of these canons will be necessary in this work. The *first*, "concerning the regal supremacy," asserts the divine right of kings; that the government of the Church belongs to them; that they are to call and dissolve councils; and that subjects are not to bear arms against their sovereign. The *second* canon has this title: "For the better keeping of the day of his majestie's most happy inauguration." In the year 1626 a service had been prepared for the anniversary of the accession; and it was confirmed by the present canon. It recites that the synod, taking into consideration "that there is a particular form of prayer appointed by authority," enacts that all persons should duly observe it by attendance at morning service.

The title of the *third* canon stands thus:—"*For suppressing the growth of Popery.*" It ordains that all the clergy should use all diligence, by private conferences as well as by Church censures. Churchwardens also are ordered to present all suspected persons. In short, the whole canon is a most decided refutation of the charge of popery so often alleged against Archbishop Laud. The charge is still repeated by many modern writers, though destitute of any foundation in fact. The *fourth* is "*against Socinianism*," and is couched in terms to which every churchman must most readily subscribe. The *fifth* is "*against Sectaries*" — namely, Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, and Familists.

Judging from the effects which were produced, we might conclude that the *sixth*, under this title, "*An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and government*," was the most important of the whole

series. It states that the synod, being anxious to declare their sincerity in the profession of the doctrine and discipline established in the Church, and to secure men against popery and superstition, decree that the oath should be taken by all the clergy. By this oath the individual pledged himself not to bring in any popish doctrine—not to give his consent to alter the government of the Church "by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c." Heylin, who was present, informs us that the *oath* was brought into the form in which it was published by the lower house of convocation.[g]

The *seventh* is "*A declaration concerning some rites and ceremonies.*" It is declared that the situation of the communion-table is a thing indifferent, "neither commanded nor condemned by the word of God;" that by Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions the table should stand where the altar had formerly stood, a custom which had prevailed in the royal chapels and in most cathedrals; and that such shall be its position in all churches. It is added—"We declare that this situation of the holy table doth not imply that it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is, and may be called an altar by us in that sense which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other." It was also ordered that it should be enclosed with rails; that at the words "Draw near," the communicants should approach to receive the elements, "which have heretofore in some places been unfitly carried up and down by the minister;" and that persons on entering the church and retiring should do *reverence* or *obeisance*, "not with any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the communion-table, or any thing therein contained, in so doing, or to perform the said gesture, in the celebration of the holy eucharist, upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus Christ on the holy table, or in the mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's

[g] Heylin's Laud, 433.

majesty." Had the objectors to these canons copied the moderation of the closing words of the canon in question, the scenes by which the subsequent period was disgraced would not have occurred. "And in the practice or omission of this rite, we desire that the rule of the apostle may be observed, which is, that they which use this rite despise not them which use it not; and that they who use it not condemn not those that use it." It appears that the moderation gave offence. "Some were offended because bowing toward the communion-table (now called 'altar' by many) was not only left indifferent, but also caution taken that the observers or the omitters thereof should not mutually censure each other."[h] The question concerning the rites and ceremonies enjoined in this canon was considered by a committee of the lower house. When their report was submitted to the house, one of the members from the diocese of Bristol presented a canon on the subject, "drawn," says Heylin, "in such a commanding and imperious style, that it was disliked by all the company but himself." The Archdeacon of Hants came in after the canon was settled; and in consequence of intemperate language, because the subject could not be reopened, he was ordered to quit the house; but was restored on acknowledgment of his error.[i]

It is worthy of special observation that this canon charges the Church of Rome with idolatry: "especially of the idolatry committed in the masse, for which cause all popish altars were demolished." If it be admitted that these canons expressed the sense of the English Church, and they have never been repealed, though they were not sanctioned at the Restoration, then it follows that the Church has pronounced Rome to be idolatrous, and that under Archbishop Laud. Or should their authority be denied, it must still be admitted that the canon in question may be regarded as evidence of the views of Laud and the Churchmen of that day. Laud was charged with popery

[h] Fuller, xi. 170. [i] Heylin's Laud, 434.

at this very time, though he had condemned Rome as idolatrous. Many charges are recklessly alleged against Laud by persons unacquainted with his views. Because he was precise in matters of form, he is charged with popery by individuals, whose views are any thing but those of the Church of England.

Not only has it frequently been said that the Church has never authoritatively charged Rome with idolatry, though no language perhaps can be more pointed than that of the Homilies, but also that the great divines of the time of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., while alleging many abuses, did not consider her as idolatrous. The assertion is directly contrary to the fact; for whenever they had occasion to speak of some of Rome's obnoxious practices, they did not hesitate to designate them as idolatrous. Bancroft, one of the most able of the opponents of the Puritans, by whom he was suspected of a leaning towards popery, simply because he enforced a compliance with the ceremonies of the Church, did not hesitate to allege the charge of idolatry. "They forbid the reading of the Scriptures; and the better to be obeyed, they will not permit the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue." His inference is, that not having the Scriptures, the people were easily drawn away from the truth: "from the sure trust and confidence in his death to masses, pardons, and I know not what intollerable superstition and idolatrie."[k]

By the *eighth* canon all the clergy were commanded to preach twice in the year on *conformity*, and to declare that the rites and ceremonies of the Anglican Church were lawful and commendable. The *ninth* related to "one book of Articles of Inquiry to be used at all parochial visitations." It is stated that such a book was prepared by the synod. The *tenth* is "concerning the conversation of the clergie;" it is in every way most admirable. In the remaining *seven* certain abuses in the ecclesiastical

[k] Bancroft's Sermon, 1588, p. 36; Barlowe's Remains, 196.

courts are corrected. Then follows the king's ratification, in which he commands that they be executed in both provinces.[l]

The canons were the great business of the convocation, though "some other things there were in proportion and design that never ripened into act of execution."[m] One of these designs was an English *pontifical*, which was to contain the *form* of his majesty's coronation, to serve for future ages on all similar occasions; another was a *form* for the consecration of churches and churchyards; and a third for reconciling those who had been under penance, or who had revolted from the faith to Mahometanism. It was proposed that these three services, with the offices for confirmation and ordination, should form a distinct volume. The design was, however, frustrated by the troubles of the times. Exceptions also were taken to the prayer in the 55th canon, and a short form was drawn up, containing the heads of that in the canon; "and being so drawn up," says Heylin, "it was to have been tendered by the hands of one of the clergy, who would have undertaken that it should be universally received by all those which dislike the other." Laud, however, fearful of a new experiment, preferred adhering to the canon which was formed on the injunctions of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth.[n]

As soon as the canons were published, the loudest clamours were raised. The *sixth* canon, containing the *et-cetera oath*, was the most obnoxious. Against this canon the pulpit and the press were engaged. Heylin says, that as ecclesiastical offices had been enumerated before, this *et cetera* was inserted in the first draught to avoid the repetition, and for no other reason; and that it was in-

[l] Heylin's Laud, 447.

[m] Ibid.

[n] Heylin's Laud, 441; Collier, ii. 793; Vernon's Life of Heylin. "I know not that a prayer from heaven would in that national religious frenzy have gone down with our distempered lecturers and people." A Defence of Praying before Sermon, 64, 65, 67.

tended to supply the names before it was engrossed. He adds, that the king, being weary of supporting the guard which attended the convocation, sent so many messages to hasten the conclusion, that in the haste the alteration was forgotten.[o]

At this distance of time, with all the evidence before us, we cannot suppose that the clause was intended as a snare. In short, the meaning is limited by the words which follow: "As it stands now by law established." All the clamour, therefore, must have arisen from party strife, or from disaffection to the Church.

A few remarks may be added respecting the authority of these canons. The objection derived from the fact of sitting after the dissolution of the parliament is of no force, since the king was at liberty to grant them a new license, which was done in this particular case. Had a second writ not been granted, the proceedings would have been illegal; for by their first writ their sitting was limited to the session of parliament. The canons, therefore, having been duly prepared and sanctioned, were undoubtedly binding on the Church. It is thought by some that they still possess synodical authority, and that they were not repealed by the 13th of Charles II. That they may be regarded as the declared sense of the Anglican Church is clear, since they have not been repealed by any subsequent convocation. The clause in which these canons are mentioned is as follows: "Provided always that this act shall not extend to give any power or authority to exercise any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, censure, or coercion, which they might not by law have done before the year of our Lord 1639; nor to confirm the canons made in the year 1640, nor any of them, nor any other ecclesiastical laws or canons not formerly confirmed, allowed, or enacted by parliament, or by the

[o] Heylin's Laud, 444. No other government could have been intended, since government was ever committed to the bishops; and the &c. which gave such offence simply referred to the various officers and orders, without specifying them.

established laws of the land, as they stood in the year of our Lord 1639."[p]

Juxon held a visitation in 1640, soon after the dissolution of the convocation. His articles were those which had been agreed upon by the two houses, and which were intended for general use. For many years the bishops had laboured to produce uniformity in the mode of performing the offices of the Church, though the Puritans constantly resisted their authority. It was the object of the convocation, in their canons of 1640, to settle various practices to which so much dislike had been manifested by some of the clergy; and Juxon's articles, being those appointed by the synod, were especially directed to the accomplishment of the desired end. By one of the canons the communion-table was ordered to be enclosed with a rail. Juxon asks, "Is it so set as is directed by the queen's Injunctions and appointed by the canon made in the synod held at London anno 1640?" It had been the custom for many years with the Puritans, unless restrained by authority, to deliver the sacramental elements to the communicants in their seats. Juxon asks, "As at his delivery doth hee rehearse the whole form mentioned in the Communion Boke, saying, 'The body, &c. &c.,' or doth he only use some part thereof,

[p] Gibson's Codex, 956. It will be observed that the act of Charles II. leaves them altogether, neither confirming nor repealing them. "These publick censures of the canons, however, grounded on prejudice and faction, have made them ever since reputed null and void, though it is hard to find any defect of legality in the making of them, or any just authority that did afterward annull them. It is true the act 13 Ch. II. cap. 12, would not confirm them, but so neither did it repeal them: they are left with the same force they had from the beginning. If the king's license and confirmation does not make the canons regularly passed in convocation to be binding without parliament, we have had no proper consent since the reformation; and those of 1603 are as invalid as those of 1640. Some writers have suggested that their invalidity arises from their passing in a convocation sitting after the parliament; but this cannot be a reason in the true constitution of parliaments and synods, which may certainly act independently of one another." Kennet further says: "It must be confessed that in very much of doctrine and discipline they would be a good example to any future convocation." Com. Hist iii. 113; Cardwell's Synodalia, i. 380-386.

as he list himself? Have you any in your parish that keep their seats and sit still in their places, not drawing neare as is commanded by the Church, but looking that the minister should forsake the place of his station by the Church appointed to bring it to them?" There was usually a question in the visitation articles of this period relative to the use of the gown in preaching: "Have you any lecturer who hath preached in his cloake and not in his gowne?" for the Puritans fought against the latter as violently as against the surplice. The diocese of Gloucester was also visited in 1640; and the articles are of the same character with Juxon's. An advertisement is appended relative to the subsidies and tenths which were collected by the bishops in their respective dioceses.

Some of the contemporary publications are exceedingly violent against these canons of 1640; for no sooner was the long parliament assembled than the press teemed with attacks upon the liturgy, the bishops, the canons, and the convocation. In one of these works we find a section thus headed: "Of their prelaticall convocation;" and a description follows: "This is a provinciall assembly, which consists of the archbishop, the president of all the other bishops, deanes, archdeacons, with others, and of the two ministers chosen out of every diocese, called the clarks of the convocation. That which is intended to be done there is contrived and hammered in the head of the archbishop and some few with him, to which the rest of the bishops doe consent. In the lower house the priests, parsons, and vicars, sit there to gaze one on another, and to tell the clocke, waiting for their lessons from their lords the prelates. There is no freedome of voices; they dare not consult among themselves. The better sort are the fewest, and are either overawed by the greatest or borne downe by the worst. So as they be made to consent to the making of such canons as they would not; and these are thrust upon us as the constitutions of the Church of England, where it's nothing so, but of a strong faction of prelates and

their adherents, who set them forth and obtrude them upon us unjustly." The canons of 1640 are especially alluded to. "Some of their blind canons, as these: against popery, but they tell us not what popery is; against Socinianisme, but without declaring what that damnable heresie is. Note moreover, there be none charged against Arminianisme, that semi-Pelagian heresie." The Articles of Visitation are then mentioned. "After some space, they collect articles, every bishop in his diocese, and every archdeacon in his archdeaconry, out of those canons."[q]

The storm which burst forth with the Long Parliament fell with the greatest violence upon Laud and Wren, especially upon the former, who was supposed to be the author of the canons of 1640, and consequently was stigmatised as a papist. Williams, probably sore from his imprisonment, which he attributed to Laud, appears to have made it his object to proceed in opposition to the canons of 1640, and to please the parliament, whose earliest attempts were di-

[q] A short View of the Prelatical Church of England, &c. Printed in the yeare 1641, pp. 31-33. The rabid character of this publication may be gathered from the following "Short Letanie:"

"From their prelatical pride and their lordly dignites,
From all their superstitious vanities and popish ceremonies,
From their late innovations and mischievous policies,
From the cursed oath *ex officio*, and high commission cruelties,
From their Romish clergie, and the people's unsufferable miseries,
From their sinful synods, and all their papal hierarchie,
Good Lord deliver us."

Yet these men, who could thus declaim against the Church of England, would have their synods. In this very publication a provincial council is recommended annually, and a general assembly every third year, "to make canons, and to establish ecclesiasticall government." After the order of Church government we have "The Second Part of the Letanie."

"That it may please thee to take into thine own hand thine own cause, to plead against all thine enemies, which would not have thee to raigne over them.

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord."

Thus these opponents of the Church would have forced their own model upon the country. Ib. pp. 39-43. At the commencement of the troubles, before the Scottish presbytery was forced upon the English parliament as the price for the aid of the Scots against their sovereign, the frequent assem-

rected against "altar-rails." Williams was inclined to mortify Laud. In 1641 Williams held his triennial visitation, publishing at the close of his articles the orders of parliament. "It is ordered by the lords in parliament that the Lord Bishop of Lincoln shall in his said visitation take order to put in practice two several orders of this house." The one was dated 16th January, 1640, the other March 1. By the latter the communion-table was ordered to stand in the ancient place. Armed with this authority, Williams published his articles of inquiry, intending to place the table in the body of the church.[r]

In this matter Williams was inclined to fall in with the parliament, in consequence of his old dispute with Laud. In the year 1627 the vicar of Grantham removed the communion-table to the east end of the chancel, at which the people complained to the bishop, who, viewing the position as indifferent, yet wishing to restore peace to the parish, wrote a friendly letter on the subject, deciding that it should stand at the east end except at the celebration of the communion, when it should be placed in that part of the church in which the minister could be best heard by the people. The letter was circulated; and in 1636 was published by Heylin at the end of his *Coal from the Altar*.[s] His aim was to prove that the reformers intended

bling of synods or convocations was a prominent feature in all schemes of Church government. In a scheme published in 1641 it is proposed, "Every three years a nationall synod to be, which for persons shall consist of all the bishops, and of two presbyters to be chosen by the rest out of each presbytery, and of two clerkes to be chosen out of every diocese by the clergie thereof. This nationall synod to make and ordaine canons; but they not to bind untill they be confirmed by parliament." The Order and Forme for Church Government by Bishops and the Clergie of this Kingdom; voted in the House of Commons on Friday, July 16, 1641. Printed in the yeare 1641. 4to, p. 3.

[r] Articles to be enquired of within the Diocese of Lincoln in the general and triennial Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God, John, by God's providence Lord Bishop of Lincoln, to be held in the year of our Lord God 1641. Printed by M. F., 1641.

[s] A Coal from the Altar; or, an Answer to a Letter not long since written

that the table should stand at the east end of the chancel, according to the practice which had been observed in the royal chapels, and in some cathedral churches. Williams was not a party to the circulation of the letter; yet it was circulated extensively; and the opposition to Laud, who wished to bring about uniformity in this matter, was thereby very much strengthened. The letter was revived when Laud began to enforce uniformity in the practice, and written copies were sold by some of the booksellers. The *Coal from the Altar* was answered by Williams.[t] Yet all this time the table in his own chapel at Budgen, as well as at Westminster, of which he was dean, stood at the east end of the chancel, according to the practice of the chapel royal. After all, Williams, as well as Laud, was stigmatised as a papist. The charge was absurd; yet it shews the character of the times, when any man was called a papist who was not a puritan. Even in the year 1641 the charge was repeated; and the most singular circumstance in the business is the fact, that it was founded on the work which he had published: *The Holy Table, name and thing.* From this very book his assailant derived his materials for the charge which he now put forth. The author asers that Williams yielded "the whole controversy, and more than all too," by his admissions. He says in his defence for publishing his book: "Though I might rather have petitioned against one of Canterburies

to the Vicar of Gr. against the placing of the Communion-table at the East end of the Chancel. 4to, 1636.

[t] The Holy Table, name and thing; more anciently, properly, and literally used under the New Testament than that of an Altar: written long ago by a Minister in Lincolnshire, in answer to D. Coal, a judicious divine of Marie's dayes. Printed for the diocese of Lincoln, 1637, 4to. Hacket's Life of Williams, 99-104, 109-112; Heylin's Laud, 162, 269, 312; Examen, part i. 277, 295; Heylin's Observations on the History of the Reign of Charles I. by H. L., 136; Barnard's Life of Heylin, 170, 171; Altare Christianum, or the Dead Vicar's Plea, 87. Burton is mentioned by Dow as carrying the sacramental elements to the communicants in their seats. Dow's Innovations unjustly charged upon the present Church and State; London, 1637, 4to, pp. 186, 187.

chaplains, who heavily afflicted me in the Universitie, or against London's officers, who have injuriously wronged me of my living; yet, digesting mine own injuries, I have rather become a humble supplicant in behalfe of the truth and doctrine of Christ."[u] As such a charge was alleged against Williams, we cannot wonder that Laud should have been stigmatised; yet the circumstances connected with the former prove that the Puritans were utterly regardless of the truth of their assertions in such matters, applying their epithets to all persons whose opinions differed from their own, and even to the Church of England itself.

The Visitation Articles and Injunctions from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the commencement of the Long Parliament, alluding as they do to all the practices on which differences of opinion then existed, furnish us with a most instructive picture of the times, and prove also that the difficulties with which the bishops were surrounded were not easily to be overcome. A few instances will suffice by way of illustration of these positions.

As the Puritans had a strong objection to some of the offices of the Church, they were accustomed to allow them to be performed by the parish clerk. The thing would scarcely be conceived possible in our times, yet the fact is certain, and it evidences the loose principles of the men who, though they scrupled at performing the services themselves, could yet retain their emoluments and satisfy their consciences by allowing men unordained to officiate. In the year 1571, Grindal, in his Injunctions,

[u] Two Lookes over Lincolne; or a View of the Holy Table, &c., discovering his erroneous and popish Tenets and Doctrine; and under pretence of defending the cause of Religion, shamefully betraying the truth and sinceritie thereof. By R. Dey, Minister of the Gospel. London, 1641, 4to, pp. 25-32. Notwithstanding the outcry against Laud about the situation of the communion-table, his predecessor, Abbot, was one of the first to issue an order on the subject. In the year 1633 a difference arose between the clergyman and the parishioners of Crayford on this point, which was referred to the archbishop for settlement, when he decided that the communicants should repair to the two "Ascents, or foot-falls in the chancel before the communion-table," and there kneel. Wilkins, iv. 479.

says, "We do enjoin that no parish clerk, or any other person not being ordered at the least for a deacon, shall presume to solemnise matrimony, or to minister the sacrament of baptism, or to deliver to the communicants the Lord's cup at the celebration of the holy communion."[v] This practice appears to have continued long after Grindal's time; since in the year 1629 and in 1633 the question is asked, "Doth your clarke meddle with any thing above his province, as churching of women, burying the dead, reading of prayers, or such like?"[w] These offices were so obnoxious to the puritan clergy, that they could so far sacrifice their consistency and violate their solemn pledges, as to permit them to be performed by their clerks.

During the whole period between Elizabeth's accession and the meeting of the Long Parliament, the charge of popery was constantly repeated against the bishops for enforcing conformity, and also against the complying clergy; yet the Visitation Articles prove that the utmost vigilance was used to check the efforts of the Papists, and to prevent the circulation of their books. Pictures also and images, which had been abused, were ordered to be removed from churches or destroyed. "Masse bookes" were inquired after by the Bishop of London in 1615.[x] Indeed the conduct of the whole episcopal bench, and the body of the clergy, disproves the oft-repeated charge of popery. On the contrary, it would have prevailed, but for the opposition of the Church. Inquiries were constantly made after Romish books, of which many were circulated secretly, written by Harding, Dorman, Allen, Sanders, Stapleton, Marshall, Bristow, and others. These writers are mentioned in their visitations, by Grindal in 1571, by Sandys in 1577 and 1578, and by other prelates in the reign of

[v] Grindal's Remains, Parker Society, pp. 123-132, 136.

[w] Articles, &c. for the Archdeaconry of Bedford, 1629; Articles, &c. Metropolitan, Yorke, 1633.

[x] Articles to be enquired within the Dioces of London, &c. London, 1615.

Queen Elizabeth. In the next reign the same vigilance was evinced; but as Brownism and extreme Puritanism had advanced, the books of the sectaries were also mentioned with those of the Romanists. The following question may be taken as a specimen of the change which the altered circumstances of the Church in the time of James I. had introduced. "Whether there be any person or persons that have retained or kept in their custodie any English or Latine bookes, or libells, set forth by Papists or sectaries?" The books both of the Papists and the Brownists and Puritans were privately printed and secretly circulated; and the bishops exercised their utmost vigilance to suppress them. Moreover, the greatest exertions were used in every diocese to reclaim popish recusants. In short, but for the efforts of the Church, Romanism would have triumphed over Puritanism. These matters were contained in all visitation articles; yet the charge of favouring Romanism was constantly repeated against the bishops.[y]

[y] During the reign of James I. several office-books were published for the use of the missionary priests, who required small manuals, which they could carry in their pockets for use in private houses. I possess copies of the following; and undoubtedly these were the Latin books alluded to in the Visitation Articles.

Sacra Institutio Baptizandi, Matrimonium celebrandi, Infirmos unguendi, ac alii nonnulli ritus ecclesiastici, juxta usum insignis ecclesiæ Sarisburiensis. 4to, Duaci, excudebat Laurent. Hellam. typog. Jurat. M.DC.IIII. permissu superiorum.

Missæ aliquot pro Sacerdotibus Itinerantibus in Anglia. Ex Missali Romano reformato. Permissu superiorum. M.DC.XV. No place is given, nor yet the name of the printer.

Ordo Baptizandi, aliaq. Sacramenta ministrandi, et officia quædam ecclesiastica rite peragendi. Ex Rituali Romano, jussu Pauli P.P. quinti edito, extractus. 4to, anno M.DC.XXIII. Neither place nor printer.

Ordo Baptizandi aliaque Sacramenta, &c. Ex Rituali Romano, &c. pro Anglia, Hibernia, et Scotia. 24mo, Parisiis, M.DC.XXXVI.

These books were specially intended for the missionary priests in England. The bishops exercised the utmost vigilance to prevent their circulation, and still they were exposed to the charge of favouring popery, simply because they defended the Church against the Puritans. The bidding prayer was alleged against Laud as an evidence of popery. "Amongst which innovations so unjustly charged, there was none made a greater or more general noise

Williams, as we have seen, fell in with the stream in 1640, and in 1641 modelled his visitation articles according to the opinions then prevalent in parliament. Yet in some things he still went against the puritan tendencies of the period. It was the custom in those days to spend at least an hour in the sermon; and Williams asks, "Doth he spend most of the houre in points of controversie, and new-start up questions of Arminianism, debarred by the king's authority from the pulpit?" Here Williams enforces the Declaration prefixed to the Articles in 1628; and though he had by some of his proceedings given encouragement to the very men whom he censures, yet he evidently foresaw the evils which would result from the state of the pulpit at that time, and used his efforts to apply a remedy.

It was the custom during these times, and it is still adopted by a certain class of writers, to charge the bishops as cruel persecutors of unoffending individuals; whereas many of the Puritans were most unreasonable men, and others evinced a spirit which was never shewn by any single prelate from Elizabeth's accession to the assembling of the Long Parliament. Some of them called for the execution of the bishops. "Is it not high time for his majestie to hang up such archtraitors to our faith, and to execute judgment on them? Certainly till his majestie shall have these purgations rectified, the suppressed preachers and preaching restored, and *hang up* some of *these Romish prelates and inquisitors before the Lord*, as the Gibeonites did the seven sons of Saul, we can never hope to abate any of God's plagues, or draw downe any of his blessings on us by such a *fast* and *fast-booke* as this, but augment his plagues and judgments more and more, which have strangely increased since this fast begun."[z] Here the

than the requiring a set form of prayer before their sermons, imputed by H.E. to the late Archbishop as an act of his, and yet confessed in the canons of 1603, full thirty years before that prelate had attained the see of Canterbury." Heylin's Tracts, 150-156.

[z] Newes from Ipswich, discovering certaine late detestable practises of

king is called upon to execute the bishops; and we know that, some years later, the same party asked for the death of Laud, who was sacrificed to their malice.

After the troubles consequent upon the proceedings of the Long Parliament, the Book of Common Prayer was suppressed, or only used in secret. Under Cromwell some of the regular clergy were permitted to occupy the pulpits, yet still the Liturgy was proscribed. In these circumstances, the men who adhered to their principles modelled their prayers before and after sermon according to the Liturgy. Remarkable instances of the kind exist in some of the extant prayers and sermons.[a] Moreover, the catechism was actually printed with some variations, in order that the clergy might use it with less risk. In this catechism, which is a curious illustration of those troublous times, obedience to the king is converted into obedience to the civil magistrate; for to have printed the sovereign's name would have been extremely hazardous.[b]

On the 3d of the ensuing November a new parliament was summoned. The convocation met; and Bargrave, dean of Canterbury, preached at the opening. Dr. Stewart was chosen prolocutor. On adjourning to Henry the Seventh's chapel, the archbishop addressed them in a strain of sorrow on the sad condition of the nation. One of the members of the lower house moved that they should endeavour, according to the Levitical law, to cover the pit which they had opened, and to prevent the designs of their adversaries by condemning the obnoxious canons. The members, however, were "not willing to condemn themselves till they

some domineering lordly Prelates to render the established Doctrine and Discipline, &c.; with their late notorious Purgations of the new Fast-Book, &c. Printed at Ipswich, 4to. It is an unpaged publication.

[a] See a singular instance in Select Sermons, &c. by the late Reverend John Hewytt, D.D., together with his Public Prayers before and after Sermon; London, 1658.

[b] The Ancient Church Catechisme, with some small additional Explanations. Printed in the time of the Churche's Dissettlement. Such is the title. No name of place or printer occurs, neither is there any date.

were accused."[c] Warminstry, the member who moved the above resolution, printed his speech; but still he was not screened from sequestration at a subsequent period.[d] Scarcely any business was transacted in this convocation; for the further progress was interrupted by the troubles of the times. They continued, indeed, to meet for a time, the bishops till Christmas, the clergy till February, when their meetings altogether ceased.[e] "As the upper house was effectually dissolved by the imprisonment of the bishops, so the lower house (knowing themselves incapable to act without the metropolitan and his suffragan brethren) did soon after retire and absent themselves."[f]

The convocation of York was summoned for the same day, but before its arrival the archbishop died; so that their meeting was prevented. On the 11th of December a new writ was issued to the guardian of the spiritualities to assemble the convocation on the 4th of January; but the disorders of the country became so great, that they never met. Thus ended the proceedings in convocation in the reign of Charles I.[g]

Almost as soon as the parliament assembled, the canons were attacked in the House of Commons, who came to a resolution that they contained matters contrary to the prerogative, to the laws of the land, to the rights of parliament, to the liberty of the subject, and that they tended to sedition. They also resolved that the grants of money by the convocation were contrary to law. When the archbishop was impeached, they were attributed to his contrivance. The resolutions of the commons are most unreasonable. There was nothing in the canons contrary to the laws, as a perusal of them will shew; but the members were determined on their condemnation.[h] The next year a fine was

[c] Heylin's Laud, 460; Collier, ii. 796. [d] Heylin's Laud, 460.

[e] Wake's State, 517; Fuller, xi. 172; Comp. Hist. iii. 125. "The lower house by degrees dwindled away." Ib.

[f] Comp. Hist. iii. 145. [g] Wake's State, 517.

[h] Comp. Hist. iii. 112, 113; Wake's State, 515, 516; Nalson, i. 678, 679; Collier, ii. 796.

imposed by the commons on the members of this convocation: "I cannot say whether it was levied," remarks Kennet, "but the parties lost all soon after."[i]

The history of the Book of Common Prayer from the reign of Edward VI., with its editions and translations, would occupy a considerable volume; yet the subject is one of unusual interest. It may be desirable to refer to the means adopted in the reign of James I. to make known our Liturgy to foreigners. Archbishop Williams is entitled to all praise, since he actually printed at his own cost a French and a Spanish translation of our Book of Common Prayer. Heylin, indeed, labours to deprive Williams of the credit of the Spanish book, on the ground that he could have no love for the Liturgy, since he never attended public worship at Westminster, of which he was dean, from the year 1635, when a pew question was decided against him, until his committal in 1637; nor yet at the Tower chapel during the period of his imprisonment. Williams's conduct in this matter cannot be justified; neither is it possible to account for it. Yet still he is entitled to all praise for his exertions in getting our Prayer-book translated into two languages, in order that the people of those countries might become acquainted with the character of our worship. The Spanish translation was effected when there was a prospect of a marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta of Spain. To accomplish his object, says Hacket, he took into his house a Spaniard, John Taxeda, "by whose conversation he grew expert in the Spanish grammar, in Castilian pronunciation, and in the knowledge of these authors, that in ten weeks he could not only understand the most difficult writers, but was able to entreat with the ambassadors without an interpreter." Taxeda was employed in the translation, which was carefully examined by Williams, and then printed at his own cost, in order that copies might be taken into Spain with the prince. Hacket was a witness of all this, and Taxeda was

[i] Comp. Hist. iii. 114.

accustomed to apply to him for instructions. "He that writes this was often at his elbow to communicate with him when he put questions how to proceed." The same process was adopted previously with the French translation. Williams made himself expert in the language; and employed De Laune, a minister of the French Church at Norwich, to make the translation. When the ambassadors came over to arrange the treaty of marriage with the Princess Henrietta Maria, copies were presented to them by Williams, at whose cost the book had been published several years before. Heylin admits that Williams did good service to the Church in this matter, though on other occasions he endeavours to deprive him of the credit of the Spanish translation. We have, however, the positive evidence that both translations were accomplished at the charge of the bishop; and for this service he was certainly entitled to the thanks of the Church.[k]

[k] Hacket's Life of Williams, 172, 209, 210; Heylin's Laud, 104, 374; Heylin's Examen, part i. 274-276; Cabula, 309.

La Liturgie Angloise; ou, le Livre des Prières publiques, de l'Administration des Sacramens, et autres ordres et cérémonies de l'Eglise d'Angleterre. Nouvellement traduit en Français par l'ordonnance de sa Majesté de la Grande Bretaigne. A Londres, par Jehan Bill, imprimeur du roy. M.DC.XVI. Avec privilège de sa Majesté. 4to.

Liturgia Inglesa; o, libro del rezado publico, de la administracion de los sacramentos, y otios ritos y ceremonias de la yglesia de Ingalaterra. Augustæ Trinobantum, CIↃ.IↃI.IXIIV. 4to.

Though Williams from political causes fell in with the Puritans, yet his real sentiments were with the English Church. He speaks of "the hierarchie as a government received from Christ and his apostles." Of presbytery he says: "God Almighty was pleased that this great king should be bred for a while in that new discipline, that he might learne in times to come how he should not discipline the Church of Christ." Great Britain's Solomon, pp. 50, 51. At the beginning of the civil wars he was in favour with the people. Thus, when the convocation was set aside, he was one of a committee for reforming the Book of Common Prayer. The result was a series of proposed alterations, which were published. A Copie of the Proceedings of some worthy Divines appointed by the Lords to meet at the Bishop of Lincoln's at Westminster, &c. London, 1641. This pamphlet was not much circulated, for the meeting at the bishop's was scattered by the bill against deans and chapters. Williams soon drew back, nor was he long in favour with the parlia-

Before we enter upon the succeeding period, a few words may be added respecting certain alleged alterations in the Liturgy between the year 1604, when King James's book was published, and the present time. I have the editions of the following years, 1604, 1605, 1609, 1615, 1622, 1625, 1633, 1636, 1637, 1639, and 1642, with some others. There are certain slight variations between the books of the reign of James I. and those of Charles I. In some cases the word *priest* is substituted for *minister;* yet there is no evidence to prove that Laud was the author of the changes, or, indeed, that they were made with any design. Laud's character is not in any way affected by the charge, since several of the later editions of Charles I. have *minister* in the rubric prefixed to the Absolution. Dr. Cardwell mentions that the Prayer-books of 1632 and 1633 have *priest,* and that those of 1634 and 1639 have the word *minister,* which are "sufficient evidence that if the alleged alterations were made clandestinely, the blame cannot reasonably be imputed to Archbishop Laud."[1] Dr. Cardwell has a copy of the book of 1633, with the word *priest* in the Absolution rubric; I have a copy of the same date, *folio,* with the word *minister.* It is clear, therefore, from the fact that my copy of 1633 has *minister,* that there was no design in the matter. And it is probable that the word

ment. A day of thanksgiving was appointed, and Williams prepared "A Form of Thanksgiving to be used the seventh day of September throughout the diocese of Lincoln and in the jurisdiction of Westminster." This was in the year 1641. The commons were greatly offended with Williams on account of this form. They resolved that he had no such power; and instead of going to St Margaret's church, where it was enjoined to be read, as the church was under Williams's jurisdiction, they attended the chapel of Lincoln's Inn after their own fashion. Subsequently a complaint was made against the curate of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, for reading this form in the church. It is gratifying to know that Laud and Williams were reconciled when the troubles of the times caused each to understand the other. Nalson's Collections, ii. 476, 477, 497; Clarendon, i. part ii. 293. The Form of Thanksgiving prepared by Williams is a remarkable production, and also rare.

[1] Cardwell's Conferences, 237.

priest or *minister* was substituted by the printer at his own discretion, or as a matter of indifference.

Dr. Cardwell mentions editions of 1634 and 1639 with the word *minister:* I have a copy of the latter year with the word *priest.* This variation in copies of the same date confirms what I have stated already, that no uniformity was observed in the matter, and that there could not have been any intention to make changes. In three other copies, of the dates of 1628, 1636, and 1637, the word *minister* occurs. This evidence is conclusive against those who wish to load the memory of Laud with reproach.

The utter groundlessness of the charge against Laud of altering the Book of Common Prayer, as well as its factious character, may be proved by an examination of the books of the reign of Charles I., and comparing them with those of James I. In the book of 1604, the standard text until the year 1662, the word *priest* occurs throughout the office for the churching of women; whereas in those books which were published in Laud's time *minister* generally appears in the versicles in that service. In the next edition, that of 1605, it is the same. This fact proves that Laud never troubled himself on the subject; for had he been anxious about it, he would have inserted the word *minister* from the book of 1604. Yet that the charge of alterations was extensively made, and even believed by some persons not altogether unfriendly to the archbishop, is evident from some productions published after the commencement of the Long Parliament. It is surprising that such erroneous impressions existed, when the charge was denied by the archbishop, and its utter absurdity might have been proved by an appeal to existing books. In "Directions concerning the Liturgy" the following proposal is made: "That whereas of late the word *priest* hath been put instead of *minister*, it may be expunged." "And likewise some clauses which seem surreptitiously to have crept into it, be expunged, as, namely, after the communion." Here a direct countenance is given to the charges of the Puritans;

yet they were altogether false. The word *priest* had not been of late introduced; on the contrary, it occurs less frequently in the books of that period than in those of the reign of James I. and the earlier part of that of Charles I. But the fact that such a charge was not attempted to be disproved shews the strength of the prejudice which then existed. The insinuation also respecting the Communion service is equally groundless. An examination of the editions of the Book of Common Prayer will prove it to have been false. The book of 1604, the standard text, and that of 1633, the edition published when Laud was in power, and supposed to contain the interpolations, agree in every particular in the Communion office; consequently nothing had crept in, as is asserted.[m]

[m] The Bishop of Armagh's Directions concerning Liturgy and Episcopal Government; being thereunto requested by the House of Commons, and then presented in the year 1642. 4to: London, 1660, pp. 3, 4, 6. This tract was put forth in Usher's name, in order to gain credit with the people. But after its first publication in 1641, he obtained its condemnation by the houses of Lords and Commons. Bernard's Judgment of the late Archbishop, &c. 8vo, 1657, p. 19. Bernard expressed his hope that the tract would not be revived to the prejudice of the archbishop's memory; yet in 1660 it was republished by the Presbyterians as Usher's; and moreover it is falsely stated that it was presented to the Lords and Commons in 1642. To serve their own ends, some of the Presbyterians, in 1660, were guilty of deliberate fraud. Parr's Usher, 66-68. This tract further adduced other objections against the Liturgy; but still it recognises convocations. "That bishops' officials might be subjected to the censure of synods and convocations." It is strange that such mistakes should have been made relative to these minute matters in our Prayer-book. Thus, Wheatly even says that the word *minister* occurred in the absolution rubric in all the books previous to the Restoration. How Wheatly could have fallen into such an error is almost inconceivable. In an annotated copy in my possession, of the year 1669, the author of the notes, which are contemporary with the book, mentions that he has a copy of 1638, and another of 1640, with the word *priest* in the rubric. The charge of inserting *at* for *in* in the epistle for the Sunday before Easter, alleged by Burton, was as groundless as the rest. Laud denied the charge; and with truth. In the books of 1604 and 1605 the reading is *in*; but in an edition of 1622 it is *at*. The latter reading occurs in the first edition, 1625, of the reign of Charles I. These facts prove that the change was first made in the reign of James. The charge alleged was, that it had been altered in the editions since 1619. Heylin's Brief Answer, 150; Dow's Innovations unjustly charged, &c. 133.

Other alterations were imputed to Laud, though sometimes they were attributed to different persons. Prynne says of Cosin, "who hath likewise lately made some alterations in our Common Prayer-booke, by what authoritie I know not:" and after an accumulation of charges he adds, "together with his alterations of our Common Prayer-booke, and putting of priests for ministers."[n] Any man was exposed to such attacks who happened to incur the displeasure of the Puritans by his conformity; though it is evident that if changes had been made, the responsibility could not have rested on so many.

But Laud was destined to endure the severity of the storm. It is difficult to account for the groundless charges exhibited against the archbishop, unless we suppose that they were fabricated for a malicious purpose. Without taking the trouble to examine into their truth, the opponents of the archbishop circulated these ready-made charges, which were greedily received by the enemies of the Church. In the first year of Charles I., 1625, a form of prayer for a fast was put forth by royal authority; and during the plague another was also published. The latter was vehemently attacked by Burton, and in the *Newes from Ipswich;* and Laud was assailed as its author. On such occasions it was usual to print the whole daily service, together with the additional prayers and collects, though at a later period the insertions only, as at present, were published. In this form of 1636 the prayer for fair weather was omitted. As the weather was exceedingly fine at the time, and as the prayer could only be used when it was unseasonable, it might have been supposed that no ingenuity would be able to turn such a circumstance against

[n] Prynne's Brief Survey and Censure of Mr. Cosens his Couzening Devotions, &c.: printed at London, 1628, 4to, pp. 92, 104. Burton, in his Tryal of Private Devotions, which is also a review of Cosin's book, states that there was "in the great printing-house at London a common Prayer-booke" altered with Cosin's hand, to shew "how he would have it altered." He says, "throughout the booke, where he finds the word minister, he would have priest put in stead thereof." Preface.

the bishops. Yet the omission was alleged as a charge: "They have purged out the prayer for seasonable weather, one cause of the shipwrecks and tempestuous unseasonable weather ever since its publication."[o] Thus the omission of the prayer in a form for a time when it could not have been used, is made the cause of the shipwrecks. Laud replies to this charge in his Star-Chamber speech: "When this last book was set out the weather was very seasonable. And it is not the custome of the Church, nor fit in itselfe, to pray for seasonable weather when we have it, but when we want it. When the former book was set out the weather was extreme ill and the harvest in danger; now the harvest was in and the weather good." Alluding to the alleged cause of the shipwrecks, the archbishop says, "As bold as they are with God Almighty, in saying it was the cause; for sure I am God never told them that was the cause." Laud then says that any clergyman could have supplied the prayer from the ordinary liturgy.[p]

In the form of 1636 an expression was omitted in the prayer for the royal family, "*Father of thine elect and of their seed.*" It had been adopted in the book of 1604, because James I. had a family; and omitted on the accession of Charles I. because he was unmarried.[q] Such was

[o] Newes from Ipswich, &c.

[p] Laud's Speech in the Star Chamber, &c., 1637. It might have been supposed that this temperate and conclusive answer would have silenced every opponent. Yet another writer, in allusion to the archbishop's answer, says, "In the Newes from Ipswich it is not said that the leaving out that prayer caused the shipwracks, but was one cause of them." Divine and Politike Observations, &c. &c. upon some lines of the Speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, &c. 1637, 4to, p. 29.

[q] Newes from Ipswich, &c.; Burton's Apologie, &c.; Heylin's Answer, 149, 150, 161, 162; Dow's Innovations, &c. 133, 134, 140, 144. The words "Father of thine elect," &c., though they occur in the Book of Common Prayer of 1625, are not found in the form for the Fast of that year. The edition of the Book of Common Prayer 1625, the first of the reign of Charles I., is, I believe, of great rarity and importance in the history of our Liturgy. I have a remarkable copy of this book. It is the identical copy used by Secretary Nicholas in his own family during the rebellion. In the prayer for the king a clause is inserted in the handwriting of Nicholas: "*may*

the character of the objections alleged by the Puritans. But they did not hesitate to say that the deaths from the plague increased greatly after the fast was appointed; an assertion which was disproved at the time by the bills of mortality, from which it was clearly shewn that they diminished considerably every week.

Though it is not my object to enter into many particulars respecting the proceedings of the Irish convocation, yet some few notices may be given in consequence of the great interest of the subject. In the year 1615 the Irish Articles were drawn up by Usher, embodying the Lambeth Articles, which gave great prominence to the doctrine of election. In 1634 the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were received by the Irish convocation as the confession of the Church of Ireland, to express the agreement of the two Churches in doctrine and discipline. A question arose afterwards, whether by this reception of the Thirty-nine Articles the Articles of 1615 were abrogated. The affirmative was argued by Heylin, the negative by Parr in his life of Usher. By the former it was admitted that they were not actually repealed, though he contends that the reception of the English Articles was a virtual abrogation of the others. Both, it appears, were signed by the clergy until the rebellion, after which the thirty-nine alone were subscribed. Usher evidently thought that the Irish Articles remained in force. "The Articles agreed upon in our former synod, 1615, be let stand as they did before. But for the manifesting of our agreement with the Church of England, we have received and approved your Articles also." A canon also was enacted to that effect. On the other hand, Bramhall considered the Irish Articles as virtually repealed. "Some who had a greater kindness for their private opinions than the union of two Churches, thought to preserve the reputation of these Articles and their own by averring that the Articles

turn and submit unto him." The initials of Nicholas are also found on the margin of the page which commences withthe Order of Morning Prayer.

of England were only received in the sense of, and as they might be expounded by, those of Ireland. Accordingly some few bishops required subscription for some time to both confessions; but it was but for some time, those of Ireland in the judgment of all being plainly antiquated; as the second title voides the first act, and the marrying of the second husband supposes the first to be dead. These Articles were therefore immediately considered as dead, though kept a little while above ground. But now they are not only dead and buried but forgotten also, those of the Church of England being the only standard of our communion." Alluding to the controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, he says: "I cannot but commend the prudence of our great adversary the Church of Rome, who thinks fit to give her children liberty to dispute eagerly enough, and will not determine in favour of either party, while both acknowledge her power, as thinking it better to have some running sores than no health; and that to close up such issues might divert the humour to some noble part, and perhaps question the seat of infallibility itself, which sits safe yet among them, though nobody knows where. So that though there be diversity of opinions among them, there is no schisme, for they all submit to the same discipline, agree in the same ritual, and say amen to the same prayers, which some understand and most do not; whereas Protestants draw their swords and fight about that which should unite them, and their very devotions and prayers are turned into contention; so that I may say their kingdom is divided in itself, but ours against itself. And at this gap our ruine enters, if we may not hope for that union from the common danger, which no other argument could persuade us to."[r]

[r] Bramhall's Life, prefixed to his Works, 1677; Parr's Life of Usher, 42, 43, 477; Judgment of the late Archbishop, 112, 117-122. Bernard contends for the authority of the Irish Articles, he having been a member of that convocation by which the English were received. Bramhall's view, however, was confirmed by the practice. Bernard argues that the XXXIX. Articles

We now pass over a period of twenty years of trouble, during which long space the Anglican Church was under a cloud, the clergy being in prison or in exile, or subjected to burdensome fines, or the total loss of their property. Other assemblies, and not convocations, were now common in England, among which the Assembly of Divines at Westminster holds a prominent place. These things, however, being unconnected with my subject, must be passed over, though in themselves of surpassing interest. The period of the civil war, the commonwealth, and the protectorate, affords no materials for the present history.

were received with, not to the exclusion of, the other. For many years the Irish Articles have not been printed with the Irish Prayer-book ; so that their authority may be regarded as set aside. Heylin says, " The whole book being called in, and in the place thereof the Articles of the Church of England confirmed by parliament in that kingdom anno 1634." History of the Sabbath, part ii. 259; Heylin's Observator Rescued, 70, 71, 249-252, 255-258. The two confessions differ so materially that they could scarcely be received by the same Church. Heylin's Laud, 271-274; Wilkins, iv. 496-516.

CHAPTER X.

A.D. 1660-1685.

Restoration — Heylin's Letter — Convocation meets — Occasional Services — Commission to treat of Canons — Adjournment — Book of Common Prayer — The province of York sends proxies — Proceedings on the Review of the Book — Review completed — Book subscribed — Sent to the Council — To Lords — To Commons — Canons of 1640 discussed — Prayer-book ordered to be printed — Act of Uniformity — Prorogation — Alterations in Liturgy — Prayer for Parliament — Situation of Communion-table — Services for certain Days — Book published — Convocation yield the right of taxing themselves — No other business during this reign.

With the restoration of the king in 1660, the Church was restored to her former position, the position which she had occupied since the Reformation. The laws enacted since a certain period were necessarily void, inasmuch as they had not received the royal assent. When the convention parliament, by whom the king was restored, met, there was no convocation, for things did not fall at once into the regular channel; and even after the next parliament was convened, some little time elapsed before the synod was summoned; a circumstance not to be wondered at after the troubles of the preceding twenty years. The Savoy conference was sitting at the time, and it is probable that the court wished to await the issue, before the convocation was called together. This conference was limited to the 24th of June, 1661.[a] The convocation was

[a] In this conference Baxter was the leader on the side of the Presbyterians. Instead of reviewing the Prayer-book, in accordance with the intention of the government, Baxter produced a new liturgy, which he finished in nine days. He admits that Reynolds blamed them for offering a new liturgy. Yet this hasty production he would have imposed upon the English Church, in the room of that liturgy which the martyrs had carried to the stake. The thing was so unreasonable that we cannot feel surprised at the issue. Baxter's Life, ii. 306, 307, 333; Long's Review, 107, 111.

convened on the 8th of May. In all probability it was hastened by a letter written by Peter Heylin. It is supposed, that on the strength of this letter the king summoned the convocation, or at all events that the arguments employed had considerable influence with those by whom his majesty was advised.[b] "At this time," says Baxter, "was the convocation chosen, for till now it was deferred. Had it been called when the king came in, the inferior clergy would have been against the diocesan and imposing way; but afterwards many hundreds were turned out, that all the old sequestered ministers might come in." This is not honest on Baxter's part. The *old sequestered* ministers *came in* by the restoration of the laws; and *came in* also to livings, of which they had been deprived by a usurping power; consequently none of the illegal possessors could have voted for members of convocation.[c]

A few particulars may be given, before we proceed to the transactions of the convocation, respecting the use of the Book of Common Prayer. As soon as the king returned, the Liturgy was read in the chapel royal, and some of the clergy introduced it into their churches. "July 8th, 1660, from henceforth was the Liturgie publiquely used in our churches."[d] While in some churches it was used immediately after the restoration, the clergy in other instances endeavoured to prepare the people for its introduction by previous sermons. Patrick, after preaching on the subject, used it on the 22d July. It is worthy of remark, that he had all along through the troubles received the communion kneeling.[e] In the month of April 1662, the communion-table in Evelyn's parish was ordered by the vestry of which he was a member, to be "set as

[b] Collier, ii. 886; Heylin's Life by Vernon, 246-252; by Bernard, 250-258; Comp. Hist. iii. 251; Wilkins, iv. 565, 566.

[c] Sylvester's Baxter, part iii. 333.

[d] Evelyn's Diary, ii. 152. An ordination occurred on the 4th of September. Ib. 153.

[e] Patrick's Autobiography, pp. 37, 38.

usual altarwise with a decent raill in front, as before the rebellion."[f]

In the convention parliament, which contained a large body of Presbyterians, the question of religion was soon introduced. On the 6th of July, 1660, on a debate respecting a bill for the settlement of the Protestant religion, some of the members "went further, which was to call a synod at the same time." On the 9th, a member proposed a national synod, when Lord Falkland argued that it was not fit to debate the whole bill in that house, but to leave the doctrinal part to a synod." Another member remarked "that the bill did not agree with the title; and that the religion of our Church was not to seek, but we have enjoyed it long, and therefore should not now be inquiring for it." At last it was agreed, that the king should be desired to convene a select number of divines on the subject.[g] In the ensuing November we meet with some notice of the Book of Common Prayer. It was moved that the book should be read in the house; when a member observed that such had never been the practice; the speaker saying that he had never heard it read, but that there was a form in the journals which had usually been read by the speaker himself. Lord Bruce moved for the Common Prayer or another form, "and not to leave it to the spirit of men; when he was reproved by another member for speaking in such a manner of those who prayed by the spirit." Even Prynne voted for the "old form," the form in the journals; and at last a committee was appointed to procure it and present it to the house. On the 7th of November the minister officiated as usual, according to the Presbyterian method, in an extemporary prayer; and when the question was resumed, one of the members proposed that a form should not be introduced until the report of the committee was submitted to the house. The speaker then "excused

[f] Evelyn, ii. 189.
[g] Parliamentary History, vol. xxii. 371, 374-376.

the minister from any more service till the form was ordered."[h]

With the king's restoration, the old laws undoubtedly came into operation; and accordingly, in February 1661, the magistrates, nobility, and gentry insisted on the execution of the laws, and that such ministers as refused to use the Book of Common Prayer were liable to a prosecution.[i]

With such a feeling, therefore, in favour of the Book of Common Prayer, it was generally used in the churches, except by the Presbyterians, before the Act of Uniformity took effect. Of course, the book so used was that of Charles I. But in the years 1660 and 1661 several editions in various sizes were published with merely the change of names in the petitions for the royal family. It is evident that old copies were not easily procured; and thus it was necessary to reprint the book. An edition was published in folio in 1660, without the name of the printer, probably very soon after the king's return; but during the same year another was put forth with the royal license.[j]

On Wednesday, May 8th, the Bishop of London, with the bishops and clergy, proceeded from the house of Dr. Barwick in St. Paul's churchyard, where they had assembled, to St. Paul's church.[k] Te Deum was sung as they

[h] Parliamentary History, vol. xxiv. 5, 6.

[i] Kennet's Register, 374.

[j] The royal printer issued several editions, following the books of the previous reign, in folio, 4to, and 12mo. Besides the ordinary edition of 1660, I have a large-paper copy of an edition of the year 1661, which contains the form "at the healing." It is printed with the book, and is not a mere insertion. It is the earliest edition in which I have found this form. In the year 1657 was published *Liturgica Sacra* by Gilpin. It is the Common Prayer in Latin verse; and it was a bold act to print it even in this form in the year 1657.

[k] "In his house finding an oratory formerly consecrated to God, but prophaned in the late rebellion, he was at the charge of restoring it to its antient beauty, and constantly performed divine service there, recommending to God the cause of the oppressed Church and king."—Barwick's Life, p. 170. In this oratory the bishops and clergy assembled. Kennet's Reg. 434. It is worthy of remark that very few of the clergy went over to the Church of

entered. A Latin sermon was preached, after prayers, by Dr. Pearce; and then the members proceeded to the chapter-house. The king's writ was read, and also the archbishop's commission to the Bishop of London. Dr. Ferne having been chosen prolocutor, was presented to the upper house on the 16th of May. The upper house began to deliberate respecting *forms of prayer* for the 29th of May and the 30th of January, the drawing up of which was intrusted to two committees, each consisting of four bishops and eight clergymen.[l]

At the *third* session, May the 18th, the Bishop of Ely brought up the *Form of prayer and thanksgiving for the King's birth and return*, for he had made his entrance into London on his birth-day. The Bishop of London also recommended at the same session, that a form should be prepared for the *baptism of adults*. During the preceding twenty years, a generation had grown up who had not been baptised, so that a special form was necessary. It was entrusted to the care of a committee of bishops, with certain clergymen; and the form for the Restoration was sent down to the lower house. At the next session, May 22d, the form for the king's restoration was presented to the upper house; and the same day an order of council was issued for printing, reading, and using the said form. This expedition was used, in order that the service might be ready for the ensuing 29th of May, on which day it was read in all the London churches.[m]

Rome during the rebellion. Evelyn mentions Turner's challenge in a sermon "to produce five clergymen who forsoke our Churche and went over to that of Rome during all the troubles, which lasted near twenty yeares; and this was to my certain observation a greate truth." Evelyn, iii. 121.

[l] Comp. Hist. iii. 252; Kennet's Register, 434, 448; Synod. Anglic. app. 67. A list of the names of the members of this convocation may be seen in Kennet's Register, 481, 482; and in Nichols's Preface; D'Oyley's Sancroft, i. 111, 112.

[m] Kennet's Register, 449, 450, 452; Synod. Anglic. 68, 69; D'Oyley's Sancroft, i. 112, 113. It was ordered that each member should keep his place; that one only should speak at once, and without interruption; and that no one should make long speeches. Ib.

Heylin, who had been chaplain to Archbishop Laud, and a great sufferer during the troubles, was at this time restored to his preferments, and came to reside in his old dwelling at Westminster. It seems that he had always been fond of making improvements in his residence, and he now erected a new room for the purpose of entertaining his friends, who resorted to him in considerable numbers. According to Kennet, he was seldom without visitors, "especially the clergy of the convocation, who constantly came to him for his advice and direction in matters relating to the Church, because he had been himself an ancient clerk in the old convocation.[n] Kennet observes, "I happened to be there when the good Bishop of Durham, Dr. Cosin, came to see him, who, after a great deal of familiar discourse between them, said, 'I wonder, brother Heylin, thou art not a bishop; but we all know thou hast deserved it.' To which he answered, 'Much good may it do the new bishops. I do not envy them, but wish they may do more than I have done.'"

On the 31st of May, being the *seventh* session, the *form for adult baptism* was approved by the upper house. A petition was read from Mr. Ogilby respecting a new edition of the Bible, which he wished the Bishops to encourage. In the lower house Dr. Pory introduced a form of prayer for the parliament.[o]

It was ordered also by his majesty in council, that a commission should be prepared to authorise the convocation to consult upon matters relative to the settlement of the Church; but special care was taken that the following clause or proviso, or any other to the like effect, should not be inserted; "provided always, that the said canons, orders, ordinances, constitutions, matters and things, or any of them so to be considered, consulted, and agreed upon as aforesaid, be not contrary or repugnant to the

[n] Kennet's Register, 450, 451; Heylin's Life.

[o] Synod. Anglic. 70. This had been referred to Pory on the 24th. D'Oyley, i. 113.

Liturgy established, or the rubric in it, or the nine-and-thirty Articles, or any doctrine, order, or ceremonial of the Church of England already established."[p] The reason for the omission is obvious. They were to proceed to alter the Book of Common Prayer; consequently the restraining clause was omitted.

At the next session, on the 7th of June, a committee of four bishops and eight members of the lower house was appointed to prepare a *form of prayer* for a public fast. This step was taken in accordance with a proclamation, issued the same day, ordering that the 12th of June should be observed in London, and the 19th in other parts of the kingdom. The *form* was used at the time appointed. In the House of Lords the following curious order was entered on the minutes: "Ordered that there be a collection for the poor to-morrow morning, and the lords to contribute according to former proportions upon like occasions, viz. thirty shillings for an earl, and twenty shillings for a baron; and such lords as are absent from prayers this day are to pay their forfeitures to-morrow."[q]

The royal commission authorising the convocation to settle the affairs of the Church was exhibited in the upper house at this session. The convocation was permitted to amend, reform, explain, and correct the constitutions and canons already made, and to make and ordain new canons and orders for the benefit of the Church and true religion. The president then ordered the lower house to be summoned, when they were directed to proceed in the business according to the terms of the commission.[r] As the archbishop was prevented from attendance by his increasing infirmities, the royal commission appointing certain bishops to act in his absence was renewed. In the tenth session, June 19th, the president informed the house, that, as there had been some defect in the former license, he had ob-

[p] Kennet's Register, 455, 456.
[q] Kennet's Register, 470; Comp. Hist. iii. 252.
[r] Synod. Anglic. 71, 72; Kennet's Register, 468.

tained from his majesty a more effectual one, by virtue of which a committee of twelve bishops and twenty-four clergymen was appointed to examine the canons already made.[s] It appears that the Archbishop of York and two of his suffragans were present in the upper house on the 21st of June, on which occasion certain bishops were appointed to prepare *articles for visitations;* and the bishops of the province of York, together with certain members of the lower house, were requested to assist.[t]

Some of the bishops of the province of York were present at another session shortly after, when the question of the liberty of the press was discussed.[u] Certain canons were brought under consideration on the 19th of July in the upper house, after which they were committed to the Bishop of Sarum. At subsequent sessions they were presented, read, and corrected.[v]

On the 23d of July, a commission, similar to that which had been granted to the convocation of Canterbury, was sent to the province of York, by which the convocation was empowered to treat of matters concerning religion and the Church.[w]

A *benevolence* to his majesty was voted in the twenty-third session; and on the 31st of July the convocation was adjourned until the 21st of November.[x]

On the 21st of November accordingly the convocation met, when the king's letters were read for a review of the Book of Common Prayer. The upper house proceeded to deliberate respecting a revision of the Book of Common

[s] Comp. Hist. iii. 252.

[t] Synod. Anglic. 76, 77. "Visitation articles are mentioned in the convocation of 1640 and 1661; but what became of the draughts I know not." Gibson's Codex, 962; Gutch's Coll. ii. 18. On the 8th of March, the Bishop of Durham, to whom the book of Articles had been entrusted, presented it to the upper house; after which the subject was dropped. Synod. Anglic. 104.

[u] Synod. Anglic. 78.

[v] Comp. Hist. iii. 252; Synod. Anglic. 80, 81.

[w] Kennet's Register, 503. [x] Ib. 512.

Prayer; and a committee, consisting of the Bishops of Durham, Ely, Oxford, Rochester, Sarum, Worcester, Lincoln, and Gloucester, was appointed to meet in the palace of the Bishop of Ely, and to sit daily, Sundays excepted, until the work should be completed.[y]

On the 22d of November the royal letters were issued to the province of York, authorising the convocation to review, or cause a review to be made of the Book of Common Prayer. The letter alludes to the commission dated the 10th of the preceding June, by which they were authorised to treat of matters concerning the Church; and then, in accordance with that commission, it proceeds, "We do hereby authorise and require, that you review, or cause a review to be had and taken, both of the *Book of Common Prayer*, and of the book of the *Form and manner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;* and after mature consideration, that you make such additions or alterations in the said books respectively as to you shall seem meet and convenient."[z]

It was considered, that as his majesty required them to proceed with all possible expedition, it would be better to send proxies to London to sit in the convocation of Canterbury, than to consume time by sending and receiving communications in the way of mutual correspondence, which had been the practice on some former occasions. Accordingly the Archbishop of York and his suffragans, being then in London, addressed a letter to Dr. Neile, the prolocutor, and to the clergy of the province, in which they mention, that they sit in the convocation of Canterbury,

[y] Synod. Anglic, 83, 84. When the synod of York met, the royal writ, with the archbishop's mandate, having been read, the question was proposed, "Doth it please you that this sacred synod of convocation do now begin, to the glory of God and the peace and public good of the Church and kingdom of England? Responderunt: It pleaseth us.—Doth it please you to begin this solemn and sacred action with prayer for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit? Respond.: It pleaseth. Tunc præses: Oremus genuflexi Pater noster, qui," &c. Wilkins, iv. 567.

[z] Wake's State, app. 238, 239.

and that as the time is short, and the method of sending communications is so *dilatory*, the clergy should pass a vote for proxies to act in behalf of the lower house. They request that an answer, containing the names, may be sent by the next post. Several clergymen were therefore commissioned to sit and act on behalf of the convocation of York.[a]

Matters being thus arranged between the two provinces, the business proceeded with rapidity. On the 22d of November, before the subject had been even communicated to York, some progress was made; and on the following day, one part of the book revised by the bishops was committed to the lower house to be reviewed. The bishops proceeded with the rest of the book in several sessions.[b]

In prosecuting this important work, the convocation was assisted by the learned labours of several individuals, who had paid particular attention to the subject. These were, first, MS. notes in an interleaved Common Prayer-book, supposed to have been copied from the collections of Bishop Overall; secondly, MS. notes in another Common Prayer-book, collected by Bishop Cosin; thirdly, MS. notes by Bishop Cosin, in his own hand; and fourthly, MS. notes by Bishop Andrews. Though not certain, yet it is highly probable, that these works were used by the convocation in the revision of the Book of Common Prayer.[c]

On the 27th of November the prolocutor returned the

[a] Wake's State, app. 239, 240; Kennet's Register, 564-566; Collier, ii. 887; Wilkins, iv. 567, 568.

[b] Kennet's Register, 566; Synod. Anglic. 84-86. Certain propositions were exhibited at York, and ordered to be transmitted to the archbishops and bishops of the province of Canterbury, to be communicated, if they thought proper, to the other convocation. "If any alteration be made in the Liturgy, is it not meet that a declaration should be published to express that such a change is not made upon the grounds pretended by those of the separation?" It was asked, whether a canon should not be framed for the better observation of the Ember-weeks; whether the Communion should not be celebrated on all the appointed days, and the second service be said at the communion-table? Wilkins, iv. 569, 570.

[c] Kennet's Register, 566. These are printed by Nichols.

first portion of the book, with certain alterations, which were submitted to the bishops; after which the remainder was delivered to the prolocutor, with a request that it should be proceeded with and returned without delay.[d] On the 28th the table of alterations made by the lower house was brought under consideration in the upper house; and on the day following some progress was made in the revision of the book for the *ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons.* On the 2d of December the *preface,* commencing with the words, "*It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England,*" was publicly read and committed to the examination of some of the bishops. On the 5th of December, Mr. Pell, who had been assisted by Sancroft, submitted the *calendar,* revised and altered, to the upper house: this also was entrusted to certain bishops for examination and revision. In the same session some discussion took place on *the form of prayer to be used at sea.*[e] On the 6th the *preface* to the Common Prayer, which was drawn up by Sanderson, was submitted to the house.[f] On the 9th certain corrections in the service for the *burial of the dead at sea,* and others in the *commination service,* and that for *the churching of women,* were read and considered. The bishops almost unanimously agreed, that one *form of prayer* should be used before and after sermons by all clergymen. This order, however, was not carried into effect. Kennet says, that the subject of the prayer before sermon was "afterwards dropped upon prudential reasons."[g]

On the 10th of December certain alterations in the *communion service* were read, after which they were entrusted to the consideration of the lower house; and on the 12th the prolocutor solicited a conference with the bishops, at which some papers of amendments in the Book of Com-

[d] Syn. Ang. 87. [e] Ibid. 88; D'Oyley, i. 114.

[f] Kennet's Register, 573; Sanderson, indeed, was very active in the whole business. Ib. 574, 576, 633.

[g] Kennet's Register, 576; Syn. Ang. 90, 91.

mon Prayer were read and approved. The next day some members of both houses were nominated for the examination and final revision of the Liturgy. A *form of general thanksgiving* was prepared and presented by the Bishop of Norwich on the 14th of December. It is frequently stated, that the general thanksgiving was composed by Sanderson; but it is clear from the proceedings of the upper house that it was prepared by Bishop Reynolds.[h]

On the 19th of December, the Book of Common Prayer being revised, the *form* of subscription was taken into consideration, and then committed to the management of two members of each house. On the 20th, the book was received, approved, and subscribed, by the members of both houses; so that the space occupied in the review was one month. "And yet, through haste and inadvertence, there were some escapes and omissions in the book sent from the convocation to the Lords. Archbishop Tenison told me, by his bed-side, on Monday, February 12, 1710, that the convocation-book intended to be the copy confirmed by the Act of Uniformity had a rash blunder in the *rubric after baptism*, which should have run, *It is certain by God's word, that children which are baptised dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved.* But the words *which are baptised* were left out, till Sir Cyril Wyche, coming to see the Lord Chancellor Hyde, found the book brought home by his lordship and lying in his parlour window, even after it had passed the two houses, and happening to cast his eye upon that place, told the lord chancellor of that gross omission, who supplied it with his own hand."[i] The following is the form of approbation and subscription.

"*Forma approbationis et subscriptionis factæ in utraque domo convocationis prælatorum et cleri provinciæ Cantuariensis in appendice Libri Communium Precum recogniti.*

"Librum Precum Publicarum, administrationis sacra-

[h] Synod. Ang. 91, 92, 93; Kennet's Register, 579.

[i] Kennet's Register, 643.

mentorum, aliorumque rituum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, una cum forma et modo ordinandi et consecrandi episcopos, presbyteros, et diaconos, juxta literas regiæ majestatis nobis in hac parte directas revisum, et quingentas quadraginta et quatuor paginas continentem, nos Gulielmus Providentia Divina Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus totius Angliæ primas, et metropolitanus: et nos episcopi ejusdem provinciæ, et in sacra provinciali synodo legitime congregati, unanimi assensu et consensu in hanc formam redegimus, recepimus, et approbavimus, eidemque subscripsimus, vicesimo die mensis Decembris, anno Domini millesimo sexcentesimo sexagesimo primo."

The signatures of the bishops are appended. The following *form* was used by the lower house.

"Nos etiam universus clerus inferioris domus ejusdem provinciæ synodice congregati dicto libro Publicarum Precum, sacramentorum et rituum, una cum forma et modo ordinandi et consecrandi episcopos, presbyteros, et diaconos unanimiter consensimus et subscripsimus die et anno prædictis."

The signatures of the members of the lower house, amounting in number to *eighty-six,* follow. The archbishop and bishops of the province of York also subscribed to a similar form; and so did the proctors for the clergy of that province. Thus was the Book of Common Prayer sanctioned by the convocation of both provinces.[j]

When the book had been thus sanctioned by convocation, the subject was taken up by parliament. On the 14th of January, a Bill for Uniformity was read a first time in the Lords; and on the 29th of January the question was discussed in the upper house of convocation.[k] The book, when revised and reviewed by the convocation, was presented to his majesty; and on the 19th of February it was ordered that the *amendments* should be con-

[j] Kennet's Register, 584, 585; Syn. Ang. 94-96; Nichols's Preface, xi. xii.; Nichols's Defence, 78-80; Comp. Hist. iii. 252.

[k] Syn. Ang. 98.

sidered in the privy council, and that four of the bishops should be present.[l] This was a preparatory step to sending the book to the House of Lords. On the 21st it was ordered that the council meet on Monday, to consider the amendment, and that four bishops should attend. On the 24th the council met in obedience to the order, the bishops also attending, when the book was read and approved, and ordered to be sent to the peers. On the 25th the lord chancellor presented the book, and recommended that the book so altered should be appointed by the Act of Uniformity. On the 1st of March the king delivered a speech to the commons, telling them that he had sent the book with the alterations to the House of Lords, that the Act of Uniformity may refer to it.[m] On the 12th of February some impatience had been manifested because the book had not been sent; when the Bishop of London stated that it would soon be submitted to their notice.[n] On the 13th of March the Earl of Bridgewater reported to the Lords, that the committee had considered the bill concerning uniformity, in which certain alterations had been made by the Commons, which were now submitted to the house. It was moved also, that the alterations and additions in the Book of Common Prayer, as it came recommended from his majesty, should be read before the alterations in the bill. Some time was occupied in considering these alterations; and on the 15th, when they had finished their task, the lord chancellor, in the name of the house, thanked the bishops for their care in this important business, and desired their lordships to convey the thanks of the peers to the lower house of convocation. It was then ordered, that the alterations and amendments in the Bill for Uniformity should be taken into consideration on the Monday following.[o]

The Book of Common Prayer, therefore, was sent to

[l] Kennet's Register, 631, 632.
[m] Ibid. 631, 632, 639.
[n] Ibid. 627.
[o] Ibid. 642, 643.

the Commons by the Lords just as it had been received from convocation. No alterations were made. The Bill for Uniformity had been discussed in the Commons before they received the book revised by convocation from the Lords. A copy of the Book of Common Prayer of 1604 had been appended to the bill, but the house subsequently made their alterations refer, not to this copy, but to the book revised by convocation and recommended by the king to the House of Lords; and on the 17th of March it was carried in the peers, that the said book should be the book to which the bill should refer.[p] The Lords very reasonably resolved to follow that book which had been revised by the convocation. Thus the Act of Uniformity appoints that the book, as reviewed by convocation, "*be the book which shall be appointed to be used.*"

On the 18th of March the president informed the convocation that the lord chancellor had desired the bishops to thank them in the name of the peers,[q] and that the Book of Common Prayer revised by the convocation had been gratefully accepted by the Lords.

The question of ordination was now set at rest by the Act of Uniformity, since all ministers were required to be episcopally ordained. This proceeding was offensive to the Presbyterians, who alleged that it involved the condemnation of those Churches that had no bishops. Much has been written on this subject; and many bishops have

[p] Kennet's Register, 643; Gibson's Codex, 276. The Lords resolved that the act should refer to the book which had been altered by convocation. The houses had proceeded with the Act of Uniformity while the convocation was occupied with the Prayer-book, and one of the old books had been attached to the bill. On the 4th April the Lords discussed the alterations made by the Commons in the Act of Uniformity. The act passed on the 9th of April the House of Lords; on the 10th a conference took place between the two houses, and then the peers directed that the act should refer to the amended book. On the 12th the Lords' amendments to the bill were read in the Commons; and on the 16th they passed the bill with the book, without debating the alterations. Kennet's Register, 656-658, 661.

[q] Synod. Anglic. 106; Nichols's Comment. Pref. xiii.

been cited as favourable to the validity of orders by mere presbyters. Bishop Morton, among others, has been adduced as a witness. It is true, that Morton recognised the foreign Churches, yet he regarded them as defective in their constitution from the want of episcopacy. He and others have been quoted in support of views which they never held, namely, to justify a separation from the Church of England. Not long before his death, Bishop Morton defended himself on this subject in his last will. "As for our brethren, the Protestants of foreign Churches reformed, the most learned and judicious of themselves have bewailed their misery for want of bishops. And therefore God forbid that I should be so uncharitable as to condemn them for no churches for that which is their infelicity, not their fault. But as for our perverse Protestants at home, I cannot say the same of them, seeing they impiously reject that which the other piously desire. Seeing, therefore, I have been so far misunderstood by some among us, as to be thought to approve of their ordination by mere presbyters, because I once said, it might be valid in case of necessity, I do here profess my meaning to be, that I never thought there was any such necessity in the Church of England as to warrant it, where there be so many bishops still surviving; and therefore I desire them not to mistake my meaning in that saying." This was written during the Commonwealth, when, if ever, a necessity might have been pleaded. Yet equally opposed was he to Rome, taking his stand in his will, as in his writings, on the *first five* centuries. "I heartily wish that all differences between us and the Church of Rome might be decided by the doctrines and practices of the Church for the first five hundred years after Christ; for that hath been my design in all my writings." In defending the bishop, the author of his life says, "How those that so zealously affect the extirpation of episcopacy can arrogate to themselves the title of Christians or Protestants is a thing that may justly be questioned, seeing bishops were planted in

the Church with Christianity even by the apostles themselves; and that the first Protestants (from whom all the rest derive that title) did clearly profess in their Confession of Augsburg their willingness to submit to their bishops, provided they would not impose upon them such new and unjust burthens as had not been received by the custome of the Catholic Church." The admission relative to bishops in the Confession of Augsburg will be found in the chapter *De potestate ecclesiastica*. Thus the first Protestants were anxious for bishops. I am convinced that Morton's views were those of all other bishops and presbyters of those times, who have frequently been cited to justify Presbyterian orders. It is true that they were admitted in cases of necessity. But many persons who cite these great men as authorities, merely give the fact, without stating the limitations, or alluding to any necessity.[r]

Other matters were discussed in convocation which it may be desirable to specify in their order. On the 8th of January the upper house took the canons of 1640 into consideration, with a view to their revival; and on the 17th the revision was committed to a committee of bishops.[s] On the 18th Dr. Barwick was chosen prolocutor of the lower house in the room of Dr. Ferne, who had been promoted to the see of Chester.[t] Some discussion also took place at this time in the upper house respecting Roman Catholic priests.[u] The question of the canons, and of the articles for visitation, was frequently discussed; but no decision appears to have been arrived at. On the 8th of March a new impression of the Book of Common Prayer was ordered to be printed; and, after some debate, Sancroft was appointed to superintend the whole, and Scattergood and Dillingham to correct the press.[v]

On the 22d of March a *Form for the consecration of churches* was discussed by the bishops, but without any

[r] Barwick's Life of Morton, 4to, 1660, pp. 47-49, 59.
[s] Synod. Anglic. 96-98.
[t] Kennet's Register, 630.
[u] Synod. Ang. 101, 102.
[v] Synod. Ang. 104, 105.

result.[w] On the 12th of April the question relative to the printing of the Book of Common Prayer was considered in convocation, and the bishops undertook to transmit it, when published, to the parishes in their respective dioceses;[x] and on the 21st the bishops engaged to see that it should be ready by the 24th day of the ensuing August. A *proviso*, for being uncovered and for using reverent gestures in divine service, was taken into consideration by the Commons, on the 28th, in their debate on the Lords' amendments to the Bill for Uniformity; but it was resolved that the question was more suited to the convocation, and it was ordered that the managers for the Commons should intimate to the Lords their desire that the matter should be submitted to that assembly. Though the Commons did not discuss the alterations made by the Lords, yet they inserted an amendment for the preservation of the Book of Common Prayer, by having it recorded in the Tower, in the courts at Westminster, and in cathedral churches. The amendment was agreed to by the Lords on the 8th of May. A curious mistake was discovered by the House of Commons in one of the *rubrics* in the *baptismal service*, *persons* being inserted instead of *children*, which was mentioned at a conference between the two houses. Three of the bishops, therefore, acquainted the house, that it was a mistake of the scribe's, and that they had authority from the convocation to correct it. Accordingly they made the correction at the clerk's table.[y] At the same time, in accordance with the request of the Commons, the bishops and the other members of convocation were desired to prepare a canon on the gestures to be used in the time of divine service. The subject was discussed on the 10th, in the upper house, when it was decided that the canon of 1604, under the title of *Solemn reverence during the celebration of divine service*, should be considered by the lower house; and on the 12th of May the said canon,

[w] Synod. Ang. 106, 107. [x] Ibid. 108.
[y] Kennet's Register, 671, 680; Syn. Ang. 109, 110.

being the *eighteenth* of those of 1604, was approved and confirmed.[z]

It was resolved also by convocation that ordinations should take place only in the Ember-weeks. The translation of the Book of Common Prayer into Latin was entrusted to Dr. Earle and Dr. Pearson.[a]

On the 20th of May his majesty's writ for the prorogation of the convocation was read; after which it was prorogued until the 19th of February ensuing.[b]

The great business of the convocation was, therefore, the revision of the Liturgy, which was appointed to be publicly used on the 24th of August. The canons were not concluded, though the convocation had been authorised to treat of them; and it appears that some powerful influence was used to prevent the two houses from proceeding with that important business. "Who they were that prevented us laying hold of an opportunity of doing the Church that service, it is not lawful to conjecture, where the case is invidious, and perhaps not sufficiently known." "The endeavours of many were wholly frustrated by one or two, on whom this matter chiefly depended."[c]

Between the Restoration and the 24th of August, 1662, when the Act of Uniformity came into operation, the ministers were left to the exercise of their own discretion in the management of public worship. They could use the Book of Common Prayer, or adopt the practice which had prevailed during the previous troubles. In the great majority of cases the Common Prayer, as we have already noticed, was restored; the people, who had never been consulted about its rejection, being anxious for its use; others read certain portions of the daily service; while some of the ministers, who subsequently were removed by the operation of the act, adhered to the practice of extemporary prayer. I have in my possession a Ms. journal

[z] Kennet's Register, 671, 680; Syn. Ang. 111, 112; Wilkins, iv. 575.
[a] Syn. Ang. 110. [b] Syn. Ang. 113; Kennet's Register, 696.
[c] Kennet's Register, 630; Barwick's Life, 325, 326.

or diary, kept by one of the members, of the daily proceedings of the first two sessions of the second parliament of Charles II., which contains much curious information respecting the period between the Restoration and the 24th of August, 1662. A few passages will shew the character of the volume.

The second parliament met on the 8th of May, 1661. The journalist enters minutely on the particulars connected with the opening of the session, after which each day's proceedings are recorded. "Satterday the 25. The house did not sit, in order to preparation to the sacrament the next day at St. Margaret's church. Sunday the 26. Doctor Gunning preached the forenoon, and Mr. Carpender in the afternoone. Doctor Gunning refused the bread to Mr. Prinn, because he did not nor would not kneele. Biscowen took it standing." After the Act of Uniformity, Prynne became more moderate, and conformed to the Church of England. It was a strong measure on Gunning's part to refuse him the bread, because the royal proclamation permitted a variety in practice until things were legally settled. On this occasion, moreover, another member was permitted to communicate standing. Some of the entries in this journal illustrate the feelings of the people relative to the Book of Common Prayer. Even in those parishes in which the most eminent of the Presbyterian ministers were placed, the people were generally desirous of having the Book restored. On the *first* of June we have this singular entry: "A petition in behalfe of one Robison was presented to the Speaker, setting forth the unjust proceedings of Mr. Manton and Doctor Baner, in the Covengarden, in arresting the sayd Robison with two writs of Middlesex of som 3000*l.*, when he owes them not a farding, don in mallis because the sayd Robison with others petitioned the Bishop of London to have the Common Prayer read in the church." This notice reflects much light on the struggle between the Presbyterian ministers and the people during this period

respecting the use of the Liturgy, the former being generally anxious for the restoration of the book. Manton had been earnest with the king the previous year not to use the book in his own chapel, on the ground that it had long been laid aside; when Charles sharply replied, that liberty of conscience must be permitted to him as well as to others.[d] Charles attended divine service at Canterbury, on his way to London, May 27th, 1660. "The king in his stay at Canterbury this Sunday went to his devotions to the cathedral, which he found very much dilapidated and out of repair; yet the people seemed glad to hear the common prayer again."[e]

Manton, however, yielded at last to the wishes of his parishioners, who presented a petition to the Bishop of London in these words: "That since, by the blessing of God, we have seen the happy restauration of our gracious king, we hope that we shall not be deprived of the exercise of religion in such manner and form as is by law established. Wherefore we humbly pray your lordship to use your episcopal power, that we may have divine service celebrated, and both the sacraments duly administered in such form and with such rites as by the laws of the land hath been most laudably ordered." "The affection of this parish to the Liturgy of the Church, without question, is one reason why Dr. Manton hath daily the Book of Common Prayer at St. Paul's, Covent Garden; and if all his brethren would do the like, we should have more devotion and less news."[f] Manton, as we are informed by Kennet, did not consent to the use of the Liturgy until the latter end of the year 1661, and then only in consequence of the petition of his parishioners.[g]

[d] Kennet's Register, 152.

[e] Kennet's Register, 162. It appears that some clergymen read the XXXIX. Articles in their churches very soon after the Restoration. Kennet mentions a case on the 24th of November, 1661. Ib. 555.

[f] Kennet's Register, 358. Newcourt's Repertorium, i. 707; Wood's Athenæ, iii. 1134, 1135.

[g] Kennet, 778.

From the Ms. journal it is evident that he did not act willingly. Kennet says nothing of the case of Robison, or of Manton's refusal to comply with the wishes of his parishioners; yet it is clear from the Ms. that his conduct was canvassed in the House of Commons in June of this year.[h]

On the 29th of May, 1661, the anniversary of the Restoration, the Ms. journal has this entry. "The house did not set this day, being the anniversary of the king, but by order went to St. Margaret's to church, where Dr. Perse preached a rare sermon." On the meeting of the parliament in its second session, November 20th, the bishops were present. They did not take their seats until this time. "From this time the junior bishop in the house commonly read the form of prayers before their proceeding to any busines."[i] The writer of the Ms. is quite enthusiastic in his description: "The Black Rod came downe and commanded us up to the king, where we found him sitting on the throne, with his crowne on and his robes, and all the peers and bishops with their robes also, so as, in my judgment, I never saw so magnificent a sight in all my life. The king spoke all himselfe."

Nye, one of the Presbyterian ministers, had been an

[h] The Ms. was written by a member of the House of Commons who was connected with the Admiralty. The first portion commenced on the 8th of May, 1661, and closes on the 6th of June, on which day the journalist writes: "My wife being very sick, I went into the country." On the previous day "I had leave of the house to go out of town." The parliament was not prorogued until the latter part of July. It was re-assembled on the 20th of November in the same year, on which day the journal commences, and is carried on regularly day by day until the 4th of February. I am unable to ascertain the name of the writer; but that he was connected with the Admiralty is evident from the Ms., as he frequently mentions his attendance at the office on business.

[i] Kennet's Register, 562. It is singular that Prynne brought forward a motion for attending divine service on the 29th of May. In the Ms. journal under May 20th we have: "Mr. Prin moved that the house might meete here on the 29th of May, and so goe to St. Margaret's church to a sermon; Doctor Perse to preach it, and accordingly ordered." The following entry marks the change in the times: "Thursday the 23d, being Ascension-day, the house did not sitt."

active agent during the previous troubles in ejecting the episcopal clergy, having been clerk to the tryers. An order was issued by the House of Commons that he should deliver to the bishops all the presentations to benefices which were in his possession.[k] In this Ms. the case is entered with more particulars. "January 7. Ordered that Mr. Phillip Nye returne all those presentations to the severall bishops that were taken by the com. of plundered ministers in these troublesome times." Again, "January 20. Mr. Crouch reported from the com. unto whom it was ordered that Mr. Nye should deliver all such presentations as were made in these times; and desired a greater liberty to send for all other persons that were in that matter concerned, that they be distributed to each bishop in his respective diocese."

Some curious entries occur respecting the attempts to discover the actual executioner of King Charles I. "January 17. Sir Edmond Perse moved that one Smith told the com. that one Mr. Darbin, living att Walton-on-the-Thames, could tell who was the person that cut off the king's head, and that he sewed it on after his execution; whereon an order was presently made that he might be sent for to the com." "January 28. Ordered that one Bickersfield be discharged without paying fees, being onely one that told who had the K. wascote, and so conceaved might be the person that cut of the K. head. But nothing was made out to the com." Then under January 30: "This being the anniversary of that dismall day of St. Charles his marterdom, the house mett at St. Margaret's, where Doctor Harding and Doctor Alsop made 2 rare sermons." He mentions a long debate on one occasion from twelve till eight o'clock in the evening, adding: "Many learned speeches in the debate, wherein it was conceaved the gent spake better than the lawyers."

It has been seen that all the corrections in the Liturgy were made by the convocation, the two houses of parlia-

[k] Kennet's Register, 602.

ment not venturing on any changes, but merely confirming the book. To specify all the alterations would occupy too large a space; I shall therefore mention only the more important. Sanderson appears to have composed some of the *new collects*, and he was probably concerned in the additional services; while Sancroft was engaged on the *rubrics* and the *calendar*. The *preface*, as has been mentioned, was Sanderson's. It contains the reasons for the alterations which were made, and it forms a part of the book.[1]

The *prayer for the Parliament* was now introduced into the Liturgy. It has formed a fruitful topic for animadversion to Dissenters from that time to the present, and it has been declared that the words "most *religious*

[1] Kennet's Register, 632, 633. In these proceedings the convocation were occupied from their 25th session, Nov. 21st, 1661, to their 48th session, Dec. 20th. Gibson's Codex, 275. It has been remarked that the Commons had proceeded with the Act of Uniformity in connexion with the book of 1604, to which their bill referred. When the Lords decided that the act should refer to the book revised by the convocation, a motion was made in the Commons that the alterations should be considered. The motion was negatived; but to assert their right, they passed a resolution that it was competent for them to do so if they had been disposed. Kennet's Register, 661. It is stated sometimes that alterations were made by parliament. Comp. Hist. iii. 252; Syn. Ang. 103, 104. But it is evident that no changes were made; none certainly were made in the Commons, nor is there any evidence of alterations by the Lords. Nothing appears to have occurred in the Lords until March 17th, when they decided that the revised book should be annexed to the act. Syn. Ang. 109. Cardwell's Conferences, 373. Burnet's testimony on this point is most decisive. He is replying to the Romish slander that ours is a parliamentary Church. "The authority of these changes is wholly to be derived from the convocation, who only consulted about them and made them; and the parliament did take that care in enacting them that might shew they did only add the force of a law to them; for in passing them it was ordered that the Book of Common Prayer and Ordination should only be read over; and even that was carried upon some debate; for many, as I have been told, moved that the book should be added to the act as it was sent to the parliament from the convocation without ever reading it; but that seemed indecent, and too implicite to others; and there was no change made in a tittle by the parliament. So that they only enacted by a law what the convocation had done." Burnet's History of the Orders of the Church of England, pp. 74, 75.

and gracious king" were introduced as a compliment to Charles II. Like many other assertions, it has no foundation to rest upon. The prayer had been in use for years, though it had not been incorporated in the Liturgy. It was first used in an occasional *form* in the year 1625; and in this prayer the words are found. In the forms for the years 1628 and 1640 the prayer also occurs. There are others between the above dates in which it is not found; but the omission is easily explained. These *forms* were published for particular occasions, to be used only once or twice; consequently, if the parliament were assembled at the time, the prayer was inserted; but if otherwise, it was omitted. In 1661 the prayer was inserted in a special *form* for the 12th of June,[m] and was afterwards placed in the Book of Common Prayer. Such is the history of this prayer, respecting which so many misrepresentations have been circulated.[n]

It will be remembered, that in the canons of 1640 the communion-table was ordered to be placed at the east end of the chancel, close to the wall, and within rails, at which the communicants were to receive the elements. Previous to the Reformation, the altar stood near the wall at the east end of the chancel. Tables were substituted at the Reformation; and by King Edward's second book they were appointed to stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel. The custom was, therefore, to remove the

[m] A Form of Prayer to be used upon the 12th of June, &c. for the averting those sicknesses and diseases, that death and scarcity, which justly may be feared, &c. And likewise for beseeching a blessing upon the high Court of Parliament now assembled. London, 1661. The prayer occurs in another form for a fast in January following.

[n] It is singular that Macpherson should have made such an extraordinary mistake about this prayer. "The convocation were in the mean time employed in the Book Office for the Baptism of those of riper years," and they added the declaration at the end of the communion-service which called Charles "a religious king." Vol. i. 38. Probably so many absurd mistakes were never crowded into so few lines.

table, at the time of communion, into the most convenient part of the church. By Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, A.D. 1559, it was ordered to be placed where the altar had stood, except at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, when it was to be removed into the most convenient part of the chancel. Laud, and several of the bishops, wished to reduce all churches to one uniform mode; and in many places the table was placed at the east end, and enclosed with rails. The charge of popery was alleged against the archbishop on the ground of this practice, and the most violent denunciations were uttered. At the Restoration the rubric was not altered; so that, both by *rubrical* and *canonical* authority, the table may be placed in the body of the church or in the chancel. From the Restoration, however, it has been the practice to place it near the wall at the east end of the chancel, and to enclose it with rails. The matter was viewed as indifferent, and consequently was left undecided, and the most complete uniformity has been the result; nor does any man imagine that its position involves the charge of popery. How soon after the Restoration the practice became uniform, it is not possible to ascertain. In one village church, however, the table was found in the middle of the chancel, and without the railing, only thirty years ago; and probably other instances may have occurred at the same period. But it may now be concluded that there is not a single parish church of ancient date in the whole kingdom, in which the table is not placed at the upper end of the chancel. "So that out of communion-time the table is to stand *altarwise*, as we, and only we, do phrase it; for altarwise is an idiom peculiar to us English, not known abroad in foreign parts; and they who can find popery in that position have better eyes than ordinary. Altars, with them, do not observe one regular position: some are placed in the middle of the choir; some at the upper part, endways north and south; and, if eye-witnesses may

be trusted, the chief altar in St. Peter's church at Rome stands in the middle of the chancel."[o]

The epistles and gospels were taken from the authorised translation; the word *priest* substituted in the *rubric* of the *absolution* for *minister;* the *prayers for the ember-weeks,* the *general thanksgiving,* and some new *collects,* were adopted. In the *communion-service* a few changes were made; and the service for the *Baptism of those of riper years,* and the *form of prayer to be used at sea,* were introduced, with the closing prayers in the *visitation of the sick.* All the services were, indeed, more or less altered, as any one who compares our present book with those in use before the Restoration may ascertain. The words "bishops, priests, and deacons" were substituted in the *litany* for "bishops, pastors, and ministers of the Church;" and the words "rebellion" and "schism" were added to the petition respecting "sedition and privy conspiracy."[p] Offices for the *fifth of November,* the *thirtieth of January,* and the *twenty-ninth of May,* were sanctioned by convocation; but as they were not in the book which was sent to the parliament, they were not confirmed by the civil authority. The service for the *fifth of November* was prepared in 1605, and was only revised by convocation. The others were new. They were annexed to the Book of Common Prayer by royal authority.[q]

o Le Strange's Alliance, 166. "The communion-tables being thus placed altarwise, the minister was enjoined, both before the sermon and after his sermon, to go up thither and read some part of divine service, which all parishioners, I believe, could not hear in any church, and not one part in five in any of the greater churches." D'Ewes's Autobiography, &c. vol. ii. 142, 143. This extract shews the strong prejudice that existed, when such a man as D'Ewes could put forth an assertion so contrary to the fact, since experience proves that in the majority of churches the minister is better heard from the communion-table than from the desk or the pulpit.

p Kennet's Register, 585, 586; Burnet, i. 183, 184; Cardwell's Conferences, 369-391; Nichols's Com. Pref. x.

q These services were changed in a subsequent reign, as will be shewn in the proper place. The 5th of November was ordered to be observed by Act

The Book of Common Prayer was published before the feast of St. Bartholomew, 1662. Copies of the first edition are by no means uncommon; but another was published during the same year, in a smaller type.[q]

Some curious particulars may be gathered respecting the state-services by a comparison of the various editions. The following statement is the result of a careful examination of the forms; and I am not aware that some of the particulars have been noticed by preceding writers.

On the 21st of April, 1662, the form for the *fifth* of November was committed by convocation to the Bishop of Durham; and on the 26th the offices for November 5th, and that of January 30th and May 29th, were read and adopted.[r]

Burnet says that Sancroft drew up the offices for the 29th of May and the 30th of January; but this statement is not correct, though they may have been submitted to him for revision. Sancroft was not a member of convocation. But Burnet adds, that they were drawn in a high strain, and then rejected in consequence as too strong; and further, that Sancroft procured the substitution of his own offices after he became archbishop.[s] All this is so incorrect, that loose as Burnet's statements frequently are, it is nevertheless strange that he should have hazarded such unguarded assertions. The truth is, the services were not again altered until the year 1685. Two offices for the 30th of January were published in the year 1661; and ignorance of this fact has led to various mistakes on

of Parliament, in the 3d of James I.; and a service was provided, which was authorised by the king. The 30th of January and the 29th of May were also ordered to be observed by act of Parliament; and the convocation, having revised and confirmed the service for the 5th of November, prepared two special services for those two days, which were annexed to the book by royal authority, according to a form still used at the accession of a new sovereign.

[q] The book was printed twice in the same year, in 8vo, at Cambridge, by Field, the University printer. I have two editions bearing the date 1662.

[r] Syn. Ang. 110; Wilkins, iv. 575. [s] Burnet, i. 184.

the subject. A very strange clause was inserted in one of the prayers, a petition in allusion to the martyrs: "that we may be made worthy to receive benefit by their prayers, which they, in communion with the Church Catholic, offer up unto thee for that part of it here militant." In the year 1710, Robinson, a Dissenter, in his *Review of the case of Liturgies*, quoted this clause; and Kennet afterwards charges him with dishonesty, saying, "No such words are to be met with in any collect of this office, nor in any other form of prayer that I ever saw on this occasion." After all, Robinson was correct in his quotation, for it actually exists in the first published form, copies of which still remain. This form, doubtless on account of the clause in question, was laid aside, and another published; and it was the latter that was examined by Kennet. He was not aware of the existence of another. On the other hand, Dr. Cardwell does not mention the second edition; for, after alluding to the obnoxious form, he remarks that the corrections were not made until the Prayer-book was revised.[t] But even the latter form was again altered, as well as that for the 29th of May, by the convocation in 1662; so that the offices in the Book of Common Prayer of that year were not precisely the same as the duly authorised ones of the year 1661. In the two forms submitted to convocation there was no order for a sermon, and various other alterations were introduced.[u]

The Act of Uniformity has been exposed to the attacks of Dissenters ever since it was passed; yet it was eminently successful in checking the advances of popery during the reign of Charles II., who readily gave his assent to the measure, in the hope of being able to dispense with its

[t] Kennet's Register, 368-370. Kennet gives the usual form of 1661; Hist. of Conferences, 388; D'Oyley's Sancroft, i. 117.

[u] Kennet's Register, 452, 453. A copy of the form for the 30th of January with the obnoxious clause is in the Bodleian. The subsequent edition of the same year, 1661, was that which was submitted to convocation.

enactments by an exercise of the prerogative. He knew well that the Romish worship could not be tolerated by act of Parliament; and it is certain that the Act of Uniformity presented the greatest obstacle to the exercise of the dispensing power. At the Revolution the act was retained, and another, the Act of Toleration, was passed in favour of Protestant Dissenters. This view of the act was adopted at the time by many persons who were anxious to keep out Romanism.[w]

This convocation was continued from time to time until the year 1678, when it was dissolved with the parliament; but very little was transacted in either province after the revision of the Liturgy. They met in 1663, and treated of a grammar to be used in schools, and also of a *Form for the consecration of churches and churchyards;* yet nothing was concluded. A subsidy was granted in both provinces.[x]

The next year they again assembled. On the 20th of April, 1664, the question of the grammar was resumed; and on the 18th of May the care of a Latin translation of the Book of Common Prayer was intrusted to the Bishop of Sarum and the Dean of Westminster. No business was transacted in the province of York. In the year 1667 we find the convocation of Canterbury petitioning the king to grant to Dr. Duport the privilege of printing his Greek translation of the Psalms for seven years.[y]

[w] Philanx Protestant, or Papists discovered to the King, &c.; to which is added, Philolaus, or Popery discovered to all Christian people, in a serious dissuasive from it; for further justification of our gracious King and his memorable Parliament's proceedings for the maintenance of the Act of Uniformity. 1663, 4to. The Act of Uniformity was considered to be more stringent than the previous acts. "This result was probably warranted and certainly excusable under the peculiar aspect of the times; but it was owing in a great degree to the rash and intemperate proceedings of the nonconformists, who had caused the flood-gates of iniquity to be thrown open, and were the first to be carried away by the torrent." Cardwell's Conferences, 464.

[x] Syn. Ang. 113-122; Wake's State, 518; Wilkins, iv. 575, 578.

[y] Syn. Ang. 123, 125, 126, 130; Wake's State, 518; Wilkins, iv. 581; Comp. Hist. iii. 269. In 1665 and 1666 the convocations merely assembled.

In the year 1664, however, a most important change was effected with respect to the clergy and the convocation. Hitherto they had taxed themselves in their synod, their proceedings being subsequently confirmed by parliament. It was therefore necessary for the Crown to assemble the synod, in order to obtain the usual subsidies. But by an arrangement between Archbishop Sheldon and the Lord Chancellor Hyde, the clergy silently waived the privilege of taxing themselves, and submitted to be included in the money-bills of the House of Commons. It was arranged that their ancient privileges should be preserved; and a clause was inserted to that effect in the bill passed on this occasion: "Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall be drawn into example to the prejudice of the ancient rights belonging unto the lords spiritual and temporal, or clergy of this realm." This act, from which the clause is quoted, was called "*An Act for granting a royal aid unto the king's majesty;*" and it was the first in which the clergy were included. "Whether this great change be more to the interest or prejudice of the Church and clergy in England, is not so easy to determine."[z]

Since this period the convocation has not been often permitted to transact business. Were the clergy still to tax themselves, they must be allowed to assemble; and when assembled, they might insist on grievances before granting subsidies; and then the Crown would be neces-

In 1667 York was prorogued to 1668, then to 1669; again to 1670. Wilkins, iv. 585-587. In 1672 York was prorogued to the next year, then to 1674. Ib. 593. It was again prorogued in 1675 from 1676. Ib. 596. In 1676 both provinces met; both were prorogued to the next year, and in 1678 both were dissolved. Ib. 599.

[z] Comp. Hist. iii. 255; Collier, ii. 893; Kennet's Synods, 299-301. According to the note of Mr. Speaker Onslow, the matter was first settled by a verbal agreement between Sheldon and Clarendon, and tacitly agreed to by the clergy. Onslow says, "Gibson, Bishop of London, said to me that this was the greatest alteration in the constitution ever made without an express law." Hallam's Const. Hist. ii. 596; Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 161, 162; A Discourse concerning the Ecclesiastical Commission, 4to, 1689, 27, 28.

sitated to permit them to take the affairs of the Church into consideration. "Being in no condition to give subsidies and presents to the Crown, 'tis well if their convocation meetings are not sometimes discontinued, if they do not sink in their insignificancy, lie by for want of a royal license, and grow less regarded when their grievances are offered."[a] Collier's prediction has been verified.

During the reign of Charles II. it was the practice in some churches to read the Communion-service, on non-communion days, in the desk, and not at the communion-table, in violation of all rubrics. A singular work, in reprobation of the practice, published in this reign, proves its existence, and also reflects light on other irregularities of the period. It was alleged "that it was indecent to go to the altar and back, with the surplice still on, to the homily or sermon (which being part of divine service is performed with the surplice on), and to return back to read the prayer for the Church militant, as they are appointed." This objection implies that at that time the surplice was used in the pulpit, even by men who read the Communion-service in the desk, and that the prayer for the Church militant was read. The author's reply to the objection is singular, as proving another practice, now generally disused. "They see no indecency in another thing; for they go out of the desk after the second lesson to baptise, and return to the same place; as if going to the east were unseemly, not going to the west." From this it is evident that baptisms took place before the congregation, after the second lesson.[b]

[a] Collier, ii. 893.

[b] Parish Churches turned into Conventicles, by serving God and worshipping him otherwise than according to the established Liturgy and practice of the Church of England; in particular in reading the Communion-service, or any part thereof, in the desk: or, Plain Reasons and undeniable Authorities alleged for the reading of the second service, or the Communion-service, when there is no Communion, at the altar or holy table. In an epistle dedicated to all the reverend clergy of the Church of England who read it in the desk. By Richard Hart, a friend to all the conformable clergy and laity of

An examination of the visitation articles from the accession of Elizabeth to the year 1640 will reflect much light on the practice in this matter during that period. The Puritans objected to the reading of the service when there was no communion at the table, and usually remained in the desk. By them the reading it at the table was called an innovation; but Laud, in his Star-Chamber speech, proves the contrary, remarking, "If this be an innovation, 'tis made by the rubrike, not by the prelates."[c] At that time Wren and Montagu enforced a compliance with the rubric in their articles: "Doth he read the second or latter service at the communion-table, and not in his pewe or reading seate, if there be no Communion?"[d] The practice is now general, no clergyman ever scrupling to read the service at the table.

In Grindal's time we meet with a singular order for reading the epistle, gospel, and the commandments in the pulpit, or stall, when there was no communion, though the prayers contained in the service were to be used at the table.[e] Such a custom could never have been common. Probably the most direct attempt to alter the custom of the Church in this matter was made by the Bishop of St. David's in the year 1583. One of his injunctions is most remarkable: "That there be no recourse by the minister to the communion-table to saie any part of service there saving onely when there is a communion to bee ministered; for it doth retaine a memorie of the idolatrous masse; for the avoyding thereof, all the service shall be said by the minister in his own seat or in the pulpit."[f]

the true and apostolical Church of England, by law established. 4to, London, 1683.

[c] Laud's Speech, &c., 41.

[d] Prynne's Canterburie's Doome, &c. 95.

[e] Grindal's Remains, Parker Society, 132.

[f] Injunctions to be observed and kept within the dioces of Saincte Davides, exhibited in the Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God Marmaduke, Bishop of Saincte Davides aforesaid, in the 25 yere of our moste gracious sovereigne ladie Elizabeth, by the grace of God queene of England, Fraunce,

This bishop must have been singular in regarding the practice as popish.

The Puritans regarded the position of the table at the east end of the chancel as a popish custom; and a constant struggle was maintained between the two parties. Yet, after all, the general practice previous to the rebellion was similar to the present, though there were some exceptions, as bishops were sometimes disinclined to interfere. In 1640 the position was fixed by the canons at the east end of the chancel; but the troubles ensued, and they could not be enforced. Subsequent to the restoration there were exceptions to the general practice, and the table at communion-time was removed from the wall. In a popular book of the reign of Charles II., the frontispiece represents the table at the entrance to the chancel, and the communicants kneeling round it at some little distance.[g] Yet, on the other hand, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, John Foxe gives a wood-cut of the communion-table in its proper place, at the upper end of the chancel, close to the wall. This was published in 1576, and appeared in subsequent editions without complaint from the Puritans.[h]

and Ireland. Cosins says with great force and truth, "We shall think it advantage enough to our cause if we shew the points questioned in our order of service to be of more ancient practice in the Church than the later corruptions of the Church of Rome which we have left; and that this Church of ours is not to forsake the primitive Church to reform herself to other reformed Churches. We will give an account of that form of service which we use, deriving it higher than the Roman Breviary or Mass, from which it is charged to come." Cosin's Preface to his Notes; Nichols's Additional Notes, p. 2.

[g] The Devout Communicant exemplified, &c., 8vo, 1670.

[h] "If they call them popish because they were abused in popery, we confess it to be true they were abused to idolatry; the bells were rung to masse, the surplice was worn at masse, in the church they said their masse, in the pulpit they maintained their masse." "Though some bells have been rung to the sacrifice of idols, may no bell therefore be rung to the service of the living God?" Mason on the Authority of the Church, 38. Calvin retained the wafer at Geneva, as a thing indifferent, though it had been abused to idolatry. Surely, therefore, the Church of England could retain indifferent

The Long Parliament was dissolved in 1678, and a new parliament and convocation were summoned the same year, and met in 1679. It was dissolved the same year, and another was called in the autumn. The new convocation met in 1680; but nothing of the slightest degree of importance was transacted in either province. This was the last convocation of the reign of Charles II. It was dissolved in 1681.[i]

ceremonies. The matters objected to by the Puritans were sanctioned by the Church,—by men as competent as any to decide such questions. They "are the public constitutions of the venerable convocation, which is the Church of England's representative, in whose voice your own voice is included." Ib. 68. We learn a curious fact from Mason's sermon, namely, that after Mary's death, the identical surplices which had been worn by the priests were used in the churches. Even when this sermon was preached, in 1605, some of these surplices were in existence. "If the staine sticke onely to the particular thing actually polluted, then this argument cannot greatly be urged against the surplesse; for not many of Queen Marie's surplesses doe remaine; and if they did, the matter were soon remedied, and time itself in short would wear them away." Ib. 44.

[i] Wake's State, 519; Collier, ii. 898; Wilkins, iv. 605. York merely met in 1679, and was dissolved; another synod assembled in 1680. Ib. 603.

CHAPTER XI.

A.D. 1685—1701.

James II. — State-services — King William — Ecclesiastical Commission — Proposed changes in the Liturgy — Convocation — Divisions — Address to the King — Convocation dissolved — State-services altered — The proposed changes in the Liturgy considered — Overall's Convocation-book and Sherlock — Controversy respecting the Commission — Works on both sides — Controversy respecting the powers of Convocation — Letter to a Convocation Man — Works by Wake, Hill, Atterbury — Convocation meets, 1700 — Its proceedings — Toland's book — Discussions — Counsel consulted — Prorogation — Lower House continue to sit — Convocation meets again — Discussions — Burnet's work on the Articles attacked in the Lower House — Disputes continued — Decision of the Bishops respecting Burnet's book — Convocation dissolved — Works on the Convocation controversy.

James II. succeeded to the throne in 1685. On the 20th of May the convocation of Canterbury assembled; a sermon was preached, and the lower house were ordered to choose their prolocutor. Still no proceedings were commenced, and it does not appear that the convocation of York even assembled.[a] Eventful, therefore, as was this short reign, it presents but little to our notice respecting the convocation. James did not permit them to transact business, since he knew that his measures would have been censured by that body. During this reign some alterations were made in the services for the 30th of January and the 29th of May, by the bishops, by authority of the crown, neither the convocation nor the parliament being consulted.

Dr. D'Oyly remarks, in allusion to Burnet's observation that these services were altered by Sancroft, who adopted

[a] Wake's State, 519; Wilkins, iv. 612. The convocation of Canterbury met in 1686, was prorogued in 1687, and then dissolved. Ib.

a loftier strain, that the service for the 30th of January has remained almost unaltered. "It stands now," says he, "with very immaterial exceptions, precisely in the same form as it did at first."[b] But the alterations in this reign are quite sufficient to justify the remark of Burnet, that the tone was altered. We have seen how it differs from the first form of 1661. "The form of prayer for this solemnity, and also for that of the 29th of May, were of a different complexion in the reign of King Charles II. from what they are now. The offices for these two solemnities were drawn up without any reflection on the first authors of the opposition. King James II. altered these forms; and King William did not venture to reduce them to their primitive state."[c]

In the service for the 30th of January the changes even from the form sanctioned by convocation in 1661, though few, were important; in that for the 29th of May they were more numerous. The service for the 29th of May in its original state was suited to the restoration of the royal family, and to the birth of the king; so that some alteration was necessary on the accession of a new sovereign, inasmuch as Charles's birth could not be alluded to in the office. King James prefixed a notice to the new office to this effect, that as several parts of the former service related to his brother's birth, it became necessary to alter it, and that it was altered accordingly.[d] Besides the changes in

[b] D'Oyly's Sancroft, i. 116. In correcting Burnet, Dr. D'Oyly has himself fallen into an error respecting the service for the 30th January; for we have shewn in the preceding chapter that it was materially altered after the first edition of the separate form in 1661.

[c] Burn's Eccles. Law.

[d] The order is as follows: "The form of prayer with thanksgiving heretofore appointed for the 29th of May, relating in several passages of it to the birth and person of our most dearly beloved brother King Charles II., and so upon occasion of his death being necessarily to be altered; and it being now, by our special command to the bishops, so altered and settled to our satisfaction, as a perpetual office of thanksgiving for the standing mercies of that day, our express will and pleasure is, that it be forthwith printed and

these two services, King James commanded the bishops to prepare an office to be used on the day of his accession. A service had been published in the time of Charles I., which was now revised and considerably altered, and put forth by royal authority. The service was originally prepared in 1626; then, in 1640, it was sanctioned by convocation. On the accession of Charles II. much of the service was inserted in that for the 29th of May; but when King James ordered the bishops to prepare another office for his accession, the old form was revised, and used during his reign.[e]

In his first speech to the council, James promised to support the Church of England. In his speech to his first

published as here it followeth, to be used henceforth upon every 29th day of May in all churches and chapels within our kingdom and dominion of Wales, in such manner as is therein directed." It is dated the 29th of April, 1685.

[e] The alterations made in the service for the 5th of November subsequent to the revolution will be noticed at the proper time, and so will those in the accession-service in the reign of Queen Anne. King James did not alter the service for the 5th of November. Gibson's Codex, 246, 249. Various changes were made in the other state-services. In the form for January 30th, in 1662, the title is simply "A Form of Common Prayer to be used yearly on the 30th day of January, being the day of the martyrdom of King Charles I." In the form as it was now settled the title is much stronger. The psalm instead of the *Venite* is different. The first collect has some strong expressions introduced, and the second collect is in a different place. Still, it is not true that the original services contained no reflections on the authors of the civil war. Burn could only have looked at the title, or he would not have hazarded the assertion. And it is further evident that he had never seen the form published before the Act of Uniformity, for it contains that portion of the title which he says was new in 1685. It was, in short, taken from the service of 1661; and even this, as we have seen, was the second form. In the form of 1661 there are stronger expressions than in that of 1662. One remarkable passage in the form of 1661 is not found either in the present service or that of 1662. "Let not his blood outcry these his prayers; but, as we are all in some measure guilty of the one, so let us all obtain the benefit of the other." In 1661 is a collect which is not found in 1662 or 1685, containing this clause: "Reunite all our remaining divisions, reconcile our differences, and change all our spirits into a sweet Christian temper of gentleness and peace." This was evidently framed on the model of the declaration from Breda. In the form for May 29th the words in the title after "Almighty God" are new. The words "great rebellion" do not occur in 1662. The state-services were printed in a separate form in this reign, as well as in 1661.

parliament, May 22d, 1685, he repeated the same words; and on another occasion he engaged to adhere to his promises. Yet, two days after his accession, he went publicly to mass; and afterwards caused it to be published that Charles II. died a papist, though the evidence on the subject is very uncertain. It is indeed doubtful whether Charles was conscious of what he was about when the priest was introduced by James. Popish officers were promoted in the army contrary to law, and mass was daily celebrated in the camp; and when parliament remonstrated, he prorogued, and then dissolved them. Papists were admitted into the council, and Romish bishops were consecrated in the chapel at St. James's; while their works were printed by Hills, his own printer. Preaching against popery was prohibited. The clergy were prosecuted for disobedience to his orders; and popish heads were attempted to be forced upon colleges in the universities. It was not therefore to be expected that he would permit the convocation to meet for business. It does not fall within my province in this work to detail the proofs of James's intention to introduce popery, from which calamity the nation was delivered by the arrival of the Prince of Orange. The thing is certain; and the Romanists rejoiced in the prospect of the destruction of the Church of England. Neither would it be convenient to enter upon particulars connected with the Revolution, though it may be observed that the important event could not have been accomplished without the Church of England. This is well put by Archbishop Wake. On the day of Queen Anne's decease, the Schism Act, which was then to take effect, was suspended by the government. In 1718, when a bill was introduced for its repeal, Wake, in a speech in the Lords, remarks: "The scandalous practice of occasional conformity was condemned by the sincerest part of the Dissenters themselves; and that he could not forbear saying, that some amongst them made a wrong use of the favour and indulgence that was shewn them at the Re-

volution, though they had the least share in that happy event."[f]

With the history of the Revolution in 1688 I am not concerned in this work; but a slight notice of some things not usually given in the narratives of the proceedings may not prove unacceptable.

[f] Lord Mahon's History, i. 498. The hopes of the papists during James's reign, and especially on the birth of the young prince in 1688, were so great, that a Jesuit ventured to publish the following work:—Carmen Genethliacon; poema in optatissimum partum serenissimi Walliæ Principis nati 10 Junii, 1688; auctore Richardo Plowden, S. J.: permissu superiorum: Londini, 4to, 1688. The author was, as the title shews, a Jesuit; yet I can find no account of him, nor any mention of the book. Patrick mentions that Tenison told him on the 7th of August, 1688, that the Prince of Orange was coming, and he advised him to remove his money from London, as no one could tell what confusion might ensue. Patrick's Autobiography, 138. Evelyn mentions the same circumstance, iii. 247. Evelyn further says, that bonfires were forbidden by order of government on the 5th of November, 1685, James's first year. Ib. iii. 193.

On the 31st of January, 1688-1689, Burnet preached before the House of Commons a thanksgiving sermon; and the fact that no remonstrance against the appointment of such a day was offered, shews how strong must have been the apprehensions of churchmen. It has some curious passages. "You feel a great deal, and promise a great deal more; and you are now in the right way to it, when you come with the solemnities of thanksgiving to offer up your acknowledgements to that Fountain of life, to whom you owe this new lease of your own." Sermon, pp. 3, 4.

Yet this day was appointed by the Church of England as a day of fasting. January the 30th in that year fell on the Sunday; and in such a case the service for the martyrdom of Charles I. is to be used, and the fast observed on the following day. It was a direct violation of the Church's order. Evelyn mentions that on the 30th of January, "in all the publique offices and pulpit prayers the collects and liturgy for the king and queen were curtailed and mutilated," iii. 269. Later, in 1692, he tells us that no notice was taken of the 29th of May. Ib. 316. Clarendon Diary, anno 1688-9.

James's folly about the Virgin Mary was egregious. An anonymous writer, in a sermon on the fast in 1690, says, "For the storm which his first putting to sea met with, some wretched worshippers of the saints and angels thanked the Virgin Mary." p. 13. That this was no false charge is now certain. Lord Clarendon, in his Diary, September 27, says: "I then went to the chancellor's; he told me all was nought. Some rogues had changed the king's mind; that he would yield in nothing to the bishops; that the Virgin Mary was to do all." Clarendon's Diary, &c. ii. 191. Jefferies's good sense was overruled by James's superstition. Dalrymple, b. vi. 192.

On the 23d of December, 1688, Burnet preached before the Prince of Orange at St. James's. The sermon, which was published, is a very remarkable production, since it gives an account of Burnet's own part in the business. In subsequent years he was fond of dwelling on this subject. He thus alludes to the seasons. "I will not build too much on the characters that have appeared in the insensible part of the creation—I mean the winds and weather—for one does not know how far these have been the effects of the natural series of things; yet one cross wind, which seemed designed only to make us apprehend the hand of heaven, without suffering much by it, and without losing above one man in it; and another strong and powerful gale, which both preserved us from those who were appointed to wait for us, and brought us so near our port, but changed immediately for another to fetch us in to it."[g] In another sermon before the king, in 1698, the bishop alludes to the same subject. "A long course of cross winds and rough weather in the beginning looked like the frowning of heaven." Then he adds: "God commanded the winds and rebuked the seas, and after that first rub all our affairs were so conducted that every thing succeeded beyond our hopes, I had almost said beyond our wishes."[h] Several years later, in another work, he enters minutely into the particulars connected with King William's arrival. "I am not ashamed nor afraid to own that I had a full knowledge of the whole progress of it; and that I had all the share in it that my capacity and station did admit of." In this work he first dwells on the principles of the Revolution. Alluding to the declaration of 1687, he says: "This was an open and avowed subversion of our constitution. If a king, in-

[g] Burnet's Sermon before the Prince of Orange, 1688, 4to, pp. 10, 11.

[h] Burnet's Sermon before the King, 1698, 4to, pp. 13, 14. It appears to have been the practice with others in subsequent years to allude in sermons to the wind and the weather at this period. "When afterwards a favourable brisk gale had carried the fleet beyond their port, a contrary wind was presently commissioned for a few hours, as it were, as if for no other end but safely to land our preservers." A Sermon on the Fast, 1690, 4to, pp. 13, 14.

stead of executing those laws, will repeal them at his pleasure, the government is entirely altered. Till that came out, I thought particular illegal proceedings were to be submitted to, rather than we should venture to an open breach. But the declaration when twice repeated seemed to me to strike at all and to alter our constitution. Upon these reasons I thought it was lawful for the Prince of Orange to come over and protect and secure us, and to maintain our laws." Then he enters on the particulars of the arrival of William. "We set out first on the 19th day of October in fair weather; but next day we had a most violent storm, with which we struggled three days in no small danger. After three days we came into port, without the loss of any one vessel, and but of one man. Ten days after, we had a more prosperous navigation. The late Duke of Leeds, and other lords who had pressed the prince most to this undertaking, moved for his landing on the mouth of the Humber. This was opposed by all the seamen, but insisted on with so positive a vehemence from England, the prince resolved to comply with it. A strong east wind made this impracticable; so we sailed into the Channel, designing to land at Dartmouth or in Torbay; but a strong gale and a bold pilot carried us beyond those ports; and on the 5th of November, when daylight shewed us the coast, we saw our danger. But in one minute in which we saw this danger, the wind turned to the south, and with a soft gale carried us into Torbay. I thought it not unfit to set this out so particularly, because on many occasions I have reflected on it in general words."[i]

In this work Burnet attributes the flight of King James to the priests, who saw that a parliament would root out popery.[j] The king and the priests preferred exile, with a

[i] Some Sermons on several occasions, and an Essay towards a new Book of Homilies, by the Right Reverend Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum. London, 1713, 8vo, preface, pp. iii. vi. ix xiv.

[j] Ib. xvi. He dwells minutely on the arrival of William in his sermon soon after the accession of George I. A Sermon, &c. 1714, 8vo, p. 16.

chance of future victory, to submission to the course of events. Burnet declares that "some who afterwards engaged violently in the Jacobite interest advised the sending the king over to Holland a prisoner. I could name persons; for the prince himself named them to me."[k]

With the convention parliament, by whom William and Mary were seated on the throne, the convocation did not assemble. The second parliament, however, in the *first* year of their majesties' reign, petitioned the throne to summon the convocation. Many there were, especially the Dissenters, who wished to settle all matters in parliament; but the House of Commons were of opinion that the convocation was the proper place for the consideration of ecclesiastical affairs.

Before, however, the convocation was convened, a preparatory step was taken, namely, the appointment of a commission under the great seal to draw up and prepare matters for the consideration of the synod. On the 24th of May, 1689, the "*Act for exempting their majesties' Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the penalties of certain laws,*" called the *Act of Toleration,* received the royal assent. Still, many Dissenters wished for a comprehension with the Church. A bill on the subject had passed the House of Lords; but the Commons considered the question as more suitable for a convocation. The Lords therefore concurred in an address

[k] Some Sermons, &c., p. xvii. In the sermon before the prince, Burnet stated that he came "detesting the imputation of conquest that was cast on him." p. 16. We are sure that Burnet was one of the chief actors in the Revolution; and these passages prove that he was fond of dwelling upon the subject. Hickes assures us that Burnet prevented the reading of the prayer for the king at Exeter, and that he sat down at Salisbury when it was used. He also says, that when a certain peer asked what must be done with the king, Burnet replied: "He must be deposed, he must be deposed." At St. James's he requested the clergyman not to pray for the king or the Prince of Wales, though he himself had used the petition for both at the Hague. Hickes's Discourse upon Burnet and Tillotson, 1695, pp. 13, 14. Clarendon's Diary; Dalrymple, ii. b. v. 21, 29, 30.

to the throne to that effect.[1] To prepare the way, the royal commission was issued, authorising certain individuals to meet and propose alterations in the Liturgy and canons, and to consider other matters connected with the Church. It was dated in September 1689.[m]

The commissioners frequently met, but some of the members who were named absented themselves, especially Dr. Jane, the regius professor of divinity in Oxford, on the ground that alterations were not required, and that the present was not the season for such discussions; yet a majority proceeded in the work. The point of greatest difficulty was that of *re-ordination;* but it was at last settled by the commissioners that the hypothetical *form* should be adopted in the case of the Dissenters as in the case of uncertain baptism, in these words:—"*If thou art not already ordained, I ordain thee.*" This would have satisfied many of the nonconformists.[n] Burnet says, "We had before us all the books and papers that they had at any time offered, setting forth their demands; together with many advices and propositions which had been made at several times by most of the best and most learned of our divines, of which the late most learned Bishop of Worcester had a great collection; so we prepared a scheme

[1] "We likewise humbly pray that, according to the ancient practice and usage of this kingdom in time of parliament, your majesty will be graciously pleased to issue forth your writs, as soon as conveniently may be, for calling a convocation of the clergy to be advised with in ecclesiastical matters."

[m] Comp. Hist. iii. 551. The following are the names of the commissioners: Lamplugh, Compton, Mew, Lloyd, Sprat, Smith, Trelawny, Burnet, Humphreys, Stratford, all bishops at the time; also Stillingfleet, Patrick, Tillotson, Sharp, Hall, Beveridge, Tenison, Fowler, Grove, and Williams, who were subsequently raised to the episcopal bench. Others were associated with them: as Meggot, Kidder, Aldridge, Jane, Beaumont, Montague, Goodman, Battely, Alston, Scott.

[n] Comp. Hist. iii. 551, 552. Tillotson, Burnet, Tenison, and all the men of that school, were willing to waive the question of Presbyterian orders by adopting this proposal. In such a case nonconformist ministers would have been admitted in the manner adopted by the ancient Church with those who had been ordained by heretics. Nichols, 119; Tenison's Life, 11-14.

to be laid before the convocation, but did not think that we ourselves, much less that any other person, was any way limited or bound to comply with what we resolved to propose."[o]

Much information was communicated on this subject, at a later period, in the speeches in the House of Lords on the trial of Sacheverel. Wake, then bishop of Lincoln, in replying to the Doctor on the point of the comprehension, says, "He who first concerted the comprehension was the late Archbishop Sancroft, towards the end of King James's reign, when we were in the height of our labours defending the Church against popery." He adds, "The several parts of the scheme were, by the direction of the archbishop, committed to such divines as were thought most proper; he took one part to himself, another was committed to Dr. Patrick; the reviewing the Liturgy and Communion-book was referred to a select number, two of whom are now on our bench, viz. the Archbishop of York and Bishop of Ely, who will witness the truth of my relation." He further remarks, "As soon as their late majesties came to the throne, they openly espoused the design; a commission was issued under the great seal to a large number of bishops and other eminent divines, to meet and consider these matters."[p]

[o] Burnet, ii. 31; Comp. Hist. 552. Dalrymple calls William's attempt at comprehension "the only idle project he ever formed;" adding, "although the House of Commons had addressed him for a convocation only with a view to disappoint his scheme, he summoned one in hopes of success. The Church seized the opportunity to raise the nation, and to display her own importance to the king." Dalrymple, ii. part ii. 144.

[p] History of the Affair of Dr. Sacheverel, 268-271; Life of Compton, 50, 51; Tenison's Life, 15. Sancroft's Articles to his clergy in 1688 were published in a separate form, and also in the First "Collection of Papers on Affairs in England," in the same year. They refer to the comprehension which he had projected. This is assigned by Wharton to the month of June. D'Oyley's Sancroft, ii. 134. Sancroft took one part of the work, Patrick another. Wake's information is extensive. "The design was to impose and enforce our discipline, to review and enlarge the liturgy, correct some things and add others, to be legally considered, first in convocation, then in the

The government, however, saw that there was no hope of success with any alterations in the lower house of convocation; consequently the subject was never introduced. The proposals were the following:—

Chanting to be discontinued.

Certain select psalms to be read on Sundays; but the daily course not to be altered.

The omission of the Apocryphal lessons, and of some from the Old Testament.

A rubric on the usefulness of the sign of the cross in baptism. The use of it to be omitted altogether when desired.

The sacramental elements to be administered in pews to those who might object to kneeling.

A rubric declaring that Lent fasts consisted in extraordinary acts of devotion, not in distinctions of meats; and another to explain the meaning of the Ember-weeks.

The rubric enjoining the daily reading or hearing of common prayer on the clergy to be changed into an exhortation.

The *absolution* to be read by deacons; the word *minister* being substituted for *priest;* and the words "remission of sins" omitted, as not very intelligible.

The *Gloria Patri* not to be repeated at the end of every psalm.

parliament, and to leave some few ceremonies, confessed to be indifferent, in their natural indifference in their usage." Some additions were therefore projected; and Wake alludes to prayers at the visitation of the sick: "new forms for the use of prisoners for debt or crimes, for receiving proselytes, reconciling penitents, and casting out notorious offenders." Alluding to the commission, he says: "Whatever they did was to have been carried to the two convocations." Account of Sacheverel, 271; State Tracts under William III., vol. ii. 71-73. Tenison's business in the commission was to collect the words and expressions to which exceptions were alleged. The original papers of the alterations were in his hands, and were given by him to Gibson. Biog. Brit. art. Tenison; Comp. Hist. iii. 591. It appears that the document is not among Gibson's papers. Cardwell remarks that the upper house fell in with William's views of toleration and comprehension, while the lower partook of the spirit of the nonjurors. Synodalia, 701.

In the *Te Deum*, the words *only-begotten Son* substituted for *thine honourable, true, and only Son.*

The 128th psalm to be substituted for the *Benedicite;* and other psalms for the *Benedictus* and *Nunc dimittis.*

The versicles after the Lord's prayer to be read kneeling; and after the words "Give peace, &c.," an answer promissory, on the part of the people, of keeping God's law, the old response being supposed by the commissioners to savour of too strong a view of predestination.

All titles of the king and queen to be omitted, and the word "sovereign" only used.

In the prayer for the king, the clause, "grant that he may vanquish," &c., changed into "*prosper all his righteous undertakings against thy enemies.*"

The words, "who worketh great marvels," changed into "who alone art the author of all good gifts;" and the words, "the holy spirit of thy grace," substituted for the "healthful spirit of thy grace." The reason assigned for the latter was this, that the word healthful was *obsolete.*

The prayer, "O God, whose nature and property," to be omitted, as full of strange and impertinent expressions.

The collects to be revised by the Bishop of Chichester.[q]

If a minister refuse the *surplice*, and the people desire it, the bishop to be at liberty to appoint another, provided the living would bear it.

Sponsors to be disused, and children to be presented in the name of their parents, if desired.

A rubric to declare that the curses in the Athanasian creed are confined to those who deny the substance of the Christian religion.

Certain alterations to be made in the *Litany*, *the Communion-service*, and the *Canons.*

Many other verbal alterations were suggested, and several things were left to the care of Tenison. Such were

[q] Patrick, whose talents so well fitted him for the work. Burnet also assisted. They were then left to the final revision of Stillingfleet, the style being polished by Tillotson. Nichols's Defence, 118, 179-196.

the alterations proposed by the commissioners. Churchmen in the present day will be surprised at some of them, and in my opinion there are but few clergymen who are not thankful that the scheme was frustrated.[r]

The convocation assembled on the 21st of November, 1689. By the majority of the clergy the changes proposed by the commission were disapproved; and they were determined to offer the strongest resistance to their introduction. They were indeed opposed to any changes whatever. It was argued that such a measure would cause the people to lose their reverence for the Liturgy. It was therefore evident that the plan of the commissioners would not be carried.[s]

[r] Birch's Life of Tillotson; Calamy, i. 452-455; Cardwell's Conferences. Calamy thought that the scheme would have brought in two-thirds of the Dissenters. He mentions that he once had an exact copy of the proposed alterations, which was lost by lending. Calamy, i. 447, 448. Tillotson advised William to call the convocation, on the ground that the settlement of such matters in parliament would give a colour to the popish cavil of a parliamentary Church. He argued that Church affairs belonged to the synod. Le Neve, i. 125; Birch's Tillotson, 179; Nichols's Defence, 116. Reresby assures us that some had made a motion in parliament for altering the creed, meaning the articles. He also mentions Burnet's anger at the address of the commons in favour of the Church, and especially at the calling of a convocation, "which the bishop said would be the utter ruin of the comprehension scheme." Reresby's Memoirs, 340, 343, 344. Calamy thinks that Tillotson repented of his advice to William. "This unhappy step of this great and good man had such consequences as we have reason to lament to this day. I doubt not, however, that he afterwards saw occasion to repent of this advice." He also remarks that William missed his aim by following Tillotson's advice. Calamy's Historical Account, ii. 203, 205, 209; Calamy's Abridgment, i. 446. Gibson says that he had seen "the Book of Common Prayer, in which were entered all the amendments proposed and resolved in the Jerusalem Chamber, anno 1689." He states that some years before he had transcribed the notes of Bishop Williams made at the end of each day's proceedings. Lambeth Mss. 1133. This volume contains a large number of letters relating to the Wake Mss. at Christ Church, Oxford.

[s] In 1689 the form of prayer used in convocation was printed by the royal printer. Forma Precum in utraque domo Convocationis sive Synod Prælatorum et cæteri Cleri, seu provincialis, seu nationalis in ipso statim cujuslibet sessionis initio solemniter recitanda. Londini, typis Car. Bill et

A very severe pamphlet was published at the time against the commission, entitled *A Letter to a Friend, containing some Queries about the new Commission for making alterations in the Liturgy, &c.* My copy of this tract forms one of a collection, which was formerly in the possession of one of the nonjurors after 1689, and by this gentleman it is ascribed to Dr. Sherlock. The author proposes several queries on the subject. "Whether there be any necessity of such alterations in the Liturgy; if there be any, for the satisfaction of the members of our Church, who generally believe there is none, why is not this necessity made appear? If there be none, whether it be for the reputation of the Church to be so frequently meditating unnecessary alterations? If not necessary, whether they are intended for the sake of the Church, or for the satisfaction of Dissenters? If for the sake of the Church, should it not be first inquired whether the Church desires it, and what alterations she requires? Should not the convocation, then, have first met and considered before the commissioners had troubled themselves to make such alterations? If for the sake of the Church, why should any thing be altered which hath the general approbation of the true members of the Church? If for the satisfaction of Dissenters, do they know what will satisfy Dissenters? Can any alterations in the prayers satisfy them who declare against all forms? Whether they ought not to have as tender a regard to the members of our own Church as to Dissenters? If such alterations should make a schism, would it not prove of more consequence than this present schism?" These are some of the queries; and it must be admitted that they are very reasonable. Experience has proved that no concessions would have induced Dissenters to conform to the Church.

Sherlock's work produced another on the opposite side

Tho. Newcomb, regiæ majestati typogr. 1689, 4to. It was therefore concluded that the two provinces might meet together in a national council. The form occurs with the Latin Prayer-book of 1703.

from Tenison, though his name was not given.[t] His aim was to shew that many things in previous times had been prepared by commissioners. He asserts that the Liturgy was revived at the restoration, by the Savoy commissioners, and then approved by the Act of Uniformity. It is strange that he could have put forth a statement so contrary to the fact, since the act merely mentions the conference, and then alludes to the review of the book by the convocation. Both, however, agreed in some things. "I am in part of the opinion of the querist, that the prayers cannot be altered for the better." This he asserts of the confession, and of other parts, but not of every collect. "But the great business is the adding to some offices, and preparing new ones, and amending the rubricks." The commission, however, failed.[u]

[t] A Discourse on the ecclesiastical Commission, proving it to be agreeable to the Law, &c., useful to the Convocation, tending to the well-being of the Church, and seasonable at this juncture. 4to, 1689, pp. 3, 4, 20, 25; Calamy, i. 457-459.

[u] Various publications appeared on the same side in the controversy. One writer would give up the cross in baptism, kneeling at the communion, and several other things, merely to please weak brethren. A Letter to a Friend on the Convocation, 4to, 1690, pp. 10, 11. He even proposes a revision of the Prayer-book every thirty years, and to expunge the Athanasian creed. Ib. 13, 15. One passage marks the confidence of the party: "If, on the contrary, by our refusal, we provoke them against us, I know not but that, instead of that moderate and just reformation which they will now be contented with, they may take the matter into their own hands, and bring us to that of Scotland, which we are so much afraid of, and deprive us of all." Ib. 26. Happily this writer mistook the people of England. The author of *Vox Cleri* says, "and if that other should be laid aside for the reasons he here gives, we might as easily fit a garment for the moon as one that should please all men." p. 49. Other answers were published to the Letter to a Friend. One writer, in Remarks from the Country on the two Letters relating to Convocation, &c., says, "Is it for our sake and perfection that we should leave the cross in baptism—the practice of the universal Church? Is it for perfection that we should lay aside the surplice for the short mantle?" p. 12. It was argued in the Letter to a Friend, that parliament would make alterations, if the convocation declined. The author of Remarks replied, that the assertion was not of English growth, adding, "for the example of Scotland, we despise the threatening." p. 17. The threat of parliamentary interference was common.

The struggle between the advocates for change and those who wished to preserve the Liturgy in its present state commenced at the very outset, in the election of a prolocutor; and it was the first cause of disagreement. Tillotson was supported by the government. On the 21st of November he was proposed by Dr. Sharp, who subsequently became Archbishop of York; but the election of Dr. Jane was carried by a majority of two to one. On the 25th the prolocutor was presented to the upper house, on which occasion he expatiated, in delivering the usual Latin speech, on the excellency of the Church of England as then constituted, intimating that no amendments could be made, and closing with the words *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*. The Bishop of London, as president, replied, that the clergy ought to be prepared to make concessions in matters not essential; and that it was their duty to shew some indulgence to the Dissenters under King William, since some of the bishops and clergy had pledged themselves to do so in their addresses to King James.[v]

The author of *Vox Cleri* replies to it, "If so, it will be their comfort that they did not put their hands to the pulling down the Church upon their own heads." p. 23. Among other proposals for change was the omission of the communion-service on Sundays, and of the second lesson in the afternoon, "to yield to the country minister's extemporary prayers and tedious sermons." p. 36. An anonymous letter is preserved at Lambeth to Tenison, in which he is asked, in reference to the commission then sitting, whether different forms may not be used for variety; whether some of the collects may not be brought into use; whether the office for the visitation of the sick may not be left indifferent; and the surplice and the sign of the cross be yielded to the scruples of the Nonconformists. "Whether some express allowance be not convenient in several things which now in many places are grown customary without one? Such are sermons in the afternoon: the liberty which is taken of y^e^ prayer before sermon. Whether some expedients are not to be found out to restore the credit of episcopacy among the vulgar." Gibson Mss. vol. ii. 183.

[v] Comp. Hist. iii. 591; Birch's Tillotson, 198-202; Burnet, ii. 33. It is said that Jane's election was owing to two disappointed peers, who stirred up the opposition Prideaux's Life, 54, 55; Wilkins, iv. 619; Dalrymple, ii. part ii. 145, 146; Compton's Life, 52, 53; Life of Tenison, 17, 18. It is said that Tillotson was secretly opposed by Compton, who imagined that the

At the next meeting the Bishop of London informed the convocation that the royal commission was defective, inasmuch as the great seal had not been attached. They were therefore prorogued until the defect was supplied.[w] During the interval, attempts were made to bring over the leading members of the lower house to the views of the commissioners, but without effect. Two arguments were chiefly used by the opponents of the government: first, that changes appeared to derogate from the dignity of the Church; secondly, that as the archbishop and some of the bishops were ready to separate, because they could not take the oaths to the new government, it would be dangerous to make any changes, lest they might be made a pretext of being for the *old Church* as well as for the *old king*.[x]

On the 4th of December the royal commission was communicated to the convocation, by which they were authorised to act. After reciting a part of the Act of Submission relative to the authority of the crown, the commission stated, that "as rites and ceremonies are indifferent and alterable," changes might be made according to the exigencies of times and places; that it was desirable that the canons should be reviewed, and the ecclesiastical courts reformed. The convocation was accordingly empowered to treat of alterations, and to form canons and constitutions, to be submitted to his majesty. The instrument was dated November 30th, 1689.[y]

king intended him for the archbishopric. Birch's Tillotson, 200, 202. It was supposed that Compton would have been promoted to Canterbury, as he had done so much in William's cause. Tillotson's elevation therefore was unexpected. Godwin de Præsul. 165, 166, 169.

[w] Dalrymple says this was a pretence, "to give time for working upon the passions of individuals" Vol. ii. part ii. 145.

[x] Comp. Hist. iii. 592; Wilkins, iv. 620; Life of Compton, 53; Vox Cleri, 59-65.

[y] For some days the litany was read by a bishop, with the addition of a supplication for the convocation: "That it may please thee to inspire with thy Holy Spirit this convocation, and to preside over it, to lead us into all

The king also sent a message by the Earl of Nottingham, in which he expresses his assurance that the convocation will not be influenced by any representations which may have been made "to disappoint his good intentions, or deprive the Church of any benefit from your consultations." He hopes that the things proposed "shall be calmly considered," and assures them that nothing will be offered which is not calculated to promote the welfare of the Church.[z] The bishops agreed upon an address to his majesty, in which they thank the king for his zeal for *the Protestant religion in general, and the Church of England in particular.* They add, "we look on these marks of your majesty's care and favour as the continuance of the great deliverance Almighty God wrought for us by your means, in making you the blessed instrument of preserving us from falling under the cruelty of popish tyranny."[a] It was not approved by the lower house, who contended for the privilege of a separate address from their own body.[b] The upper house did not admit that they had any such right, upon which the clergy proceeded to make amendments in the address, alleging, in justification of their proceeding, that they wished to confine themselves to such things only in his majesty's message as concerned the Church of England. A conference was therefore proposed, which was managed chiefly by the Bishop of Salisbury and the prolocutor. The words *Protestant religion* were objected to; but the bishops contended for the expression: first, because it was the known designation of

truth which is according to godliness." At other meetings, when there was no sermon, there was a prayer for the parliament, with five collects, that for St. Simon and St. Jude's day, one of those for Good Friday, that for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity, and two others adapted to the occasion, with the prayer of St. Chrysostom. The names were then called over. Vox Cleri, 59-65.

[z] Comp. Hist. iii. 593; Wilkins, iv. 621; Somers Tracts, ii. 333, 334.

[a] Comp. Hist. 593; Vox Cleri, 68.

[b] They resolved "to return thanks to the king in a form of their own." Vox Cleri, 62.

the common doctrine of the western part of Christendom, in opposition to the corruptions of the Romish Church; secondly, because the omission would be liable to strange constructions; thirdly, because it agrees with the general reasons offered for amendments by the clergy. The lower house resolved to substitute *Protestant Churches* for *Protestant religion;* and when the bishops demanded a reason, they answered, "We being the representatives of a formed Established Church, do not think fit to mention the word *religion* any further than it is the religion of some *formed Established Church.*" The Bishop of Salisbury argued that the Church of England was only distinguished from other Protestant Churches by its *hierarchy* and *revenues;* and that if popery could prevail, it would be called the Church of England, so that the expression was equivocal. The prolocutor replied, that the Church of England was distinguished by its doctrines, as contained in the *Articles*, *Liturgy*, and *Homilies*, and that the term *Protestant Churches* was much more equivocal, since *Socinians*, *Anabaptists*, and *Quakers* assumed the title.[c]

The amendments were returned by the bishops with this alteration, "We doubt not the interest of the Protestant religion in this and all other Protestant Churches." The lower house requested the omission of the words *this* and *and*, lest the Church of England should suffer diminution in being joined with *foreign Protestant Churches.* These words, with the passage relative to the *deliverance from popish tyranny*, were at last omitted. In short, the address, in its amended form, was quite different from that which was originally framed by the bishops. There was no allusion in the amended address to his majesty's zeal for the Protestant religion, nor was there any ex-

[c] Calamy, i. 463; Vox Cleri, 68, 69. "We agreed upon an address by leaving out several things we had proposed, which we thought better than to contend longer with one another." Patrick's Autobiography, 155. It was debated in this convocation whether proxies should be admitted, and decided in the affirmative. Vox Cleri, 69.

pression of thanks for his majesty's commission. The following answer was returned:

"My lord, I take this address very kindly from the convocation. You may depend upon it, that all I have promised, and all that I can do for the service of the Church of England, I will do. And I give you this new assurance, that I will improve all occasions and opportunities for its service."[d]

The majority of the lower house were disposed to view Sancroft and his nonjuring brethren with favour; and one member proposed that some steps should be taken by which the suspended bishops might take their seats. Kennet, who well understood the feelings of parties at the time, says that the matter was deferred for further consideration, while the members "laboured to find some other business to divert them from that for which they were called together." The prolocutor therefore represented that some dangerous books, especially one on the *Athanasian* Creed and *Two Letters* on the present convocation, were circulated; and he requested the advice of the bishops on the subject. The president expressed his sense of the character of the books, but could not say how far the convocation was at liberty to proceed in such a business.[e]

The convocation, on the 13th of December, was adjourned until the 24th of January, and soon after was dissolved with the parliament. The king was advised, under the circumstances, to dissolve the assembly without per-

[d] Vox Cleri, 69-72; Comp. Hist. iii. 594; Calamy, i. 463, 464; Tindal's Cont. iii. 109, 110; Wilkins, iv. 621; Compton's Life, 54, 55; Patrick, 153-155; Cardwell's Conferences, 440-450; Birch's Tillotson, 204, 205; Burnet, ii. 33, who remarks, that "it was not carried without difficulty to make a decent address to the king."

[e] Comp. Hist. 594, 595; Birch's Tillotson, 207, 208; Prideaux's Life, 56, 57; Compton's Life, 56. The author of the Life of Compton says: "It must be confessed that the Presbyterians did not a little to exasperate the convocation against them, having at that very time given orders to near fifty young students." p. 57; Calamy's Hist. Account, 211, 212.

mitting them to enter on the business proposed in the commission. Several measures besides those which are specified in the commission were in contemplation by various members, and among others a book of *family prayers*. "There was also provided a family book to be authorised by this convocation; it contained directions for family devotions, with several forms of prayer." It appears that Tenison was the compiler, for the writer of the *Life of Dean Prideaux* says, "Some years after the breaking up of this convocation, as he was walking with Archbishop Tenison in his garden at Lambeth, he pressed the archbishop very much to publish his book; but the archbishop thought it had best be done with the concurrence of convocation." Prideaux opposed this view, telling Tenison, who said that there were thoughts of calling a convocation, that it would be dangerous to summon them until the clergy should be in a better temper. The book was afterwards lost.[f]

In the year 1689, the *State-services*, as they are usually termed, were again to be considered. The service for the *fifth of November* was now altered, so as to render it suitable to the two events, namely, the *Papists' conspiracy* and the *arrival of King William*. During the reign of Charles II. the three services were authorised by an order in council; but when the *form* for the *fifth of November* was altered, it was set forth by a special order dated October the 19th, 1690, the name of the king being attached. It was ordered to be printed and published, and annexed to the Book of Common Prayer. Thus, in an edition of the Book of Common Prayer of the year 1691, the service for the *fifth of November* is accompanied by the separate order. It is singular that in this edition the service for the *Restoration* has the separate order in council prepared and issued in the time of King James, with his majesty's name attached. In another edition of the year 1692 there is the separate order for the service for

[f] Prideaux's Life, 61-65.

the *fifth of November*, and then the usual order for the three together at the close of the third. Subsequent to this period the separate orders for the services for the *fifth of November* and the *twenty-ninth of May* were omitted, the one form being used for the three. This is the case in an edition of the Liturgy of the year 1700. The order for the three services is dated the 6th of October, 1692, and is issued in the name of Queen Mary. The services for the 30th of January and the 29th of May were not altered by King William, but adopted in the state in which they were left by King James.[g]

Burnet, who was very anxious at the time for the changes, admits that the providence of God was displayed in the proceedings which led to a refusal to make alterations in the Liturgy. He allows that had changes taken place, many persons would have adhered to the nonjurors, who would have been viewed as the old and true Church of England. It is evident, indeed, that the consequences of such changes must at that time have been most disastrous. It must also be confessed that some of the proposed alterations were *frivolous*, while others were decidedly objectionable. Tindal says the nonjurors were dis-

[g] "I was desired at the end of the month (October) to join with the Bishops of London and Rochester in making some new prayers for the 5th of November, when, together with the gunpowder treason, we commemorate the king's landing to give us a new deliverance." The Bishop of Rochester, according to Patrick, declined from want of leisure, and the latter proceeded with the work. "On the 30th I revised all the service." This seems to have been done while the commission was sitting. Patrick's Autobiography, 152. Yet the Bishop of Rochester, in a letter dated Oct. 27th, says that he revised the service, mentioning a new collect, and suggesting that the old prayers may be accommodated by "the alteration of a word or two in each." He gives the proposed collect, which was adopted. Another, which was proposed after the litany, was not inserted. Gutch's Coll. ii. 381, 384. Burnet, in his remarkable sermon before the commons, January 31st, 1688-9, says: "Now our *fifth* of November is to be enriched by a second service, since God has ennobled it so far as to be the beginning of that which, we may justly hope, shall be our compleat deliverance from all plots and conspiracies; and that this second day shall darken, if not quite wear out the former." p. 34.

appointed by the refusal to alter the Liturgy, as they wished for a good pretence for their separation.[h]

The lower house were undoubtedly induced to take a gloomy view of the prospects of the Church, in consequence of the proceedings in Scotland. In that country episcopacy had been abolished by the present government; and there was an apprehension lest a similar attempt should be made in England; so that their opposition was not unreasonable. It was imagined that the predilections of the king were in favour of presbytery, and that the safer course would be to resist all changes. That their views were sound was afterwards admitted by Burnet; or at all events he admits that their opposition was overruled for good.[i]

Tillotson was elevated to the see of Canterbury after the deprivation of Sancroft; and during his primacy no business was transacted in convocation. Ten years elapsed without any synodical proceedings beyond the mere meeting and adjourning. "They were kept from doing

[h] Tindal's Cont. iii. 111; Birch's Tillotson, 209; Burnet, ii. 34. Birch remarks that the changes would have done harm. It was stated in a sermon before the lower house of convocation in 1701, that some of the men who concurred in the proposed changes subsequently expressed their gratitude at the defeat of the scheme. "A Liturgy so perfect, that we know that there are persons of no small note who have expressed themselves to be not a little pleased, that their proposals (without doubt honestly designed) were as honestly rejected, and allowing that our constitution was saved in so friendly an opposition." Remarks on the Candid Disquisitions, part ii. 148. It is now evident that much evil would have ensued from any alterations, while the Dissenters would not have been gained by the scheme which was then propounded. "But there was a very happy direction of the providence of God observed in this matter. For by all the judgments we could afterwards make, if we had carried a majority in the convocation for alterations, they would have done us more harm than good." Burnet, ii. 33, 34. "Many feared that the devise of alterations was a design to overthrow the Church; and they could not avoid casting their eyes to Scotland." Nichols's Defence, p. 120.

[i] Nichols's Defence, 121. "No misfortune so sensibly afflicted the Church as the dissension between the clergy. For hitherto our clergy had lived with great concord among themselves, not to be divided by any arts of their adversaries." Ib. 123.

mischief by prorogations for a course of ten years."[j] The government were afraid of their meetings. For a time both parties were silent respecting the convocation; the advocates of the changes hoping that the opposition would subside after an interval, and the opponents being content not to revive a question on which such strong feelings were entertained. Under these circumstances the convocation was prorogued from time to time until the year 1700.

Before we proceed in the history, we must notice a remarkable effect produced by the *Convocation-book* of Bishop Overall, which was published at this time by Archbishop Sancroft, as has already been noticed in a preceding chapter. Dr. Sherlock, who hesitated to take the oaths to the new government, professed that his scruples were removed by this book.[k] The Netherlands had revolted from the Spaniards, and in allusion to their case, the convocation of 1606, though on all other points they carried the royal prerogative very high, decided that a government when fully settled, though commenced in rebellion, was lawful, and that submission might be yielded to it. It is clear that Sancroft had not considered the passage in question. Sherlock, however, took the oaths on the ground that the Anglican Church recognised a government *de facto*. He also endeavoured to induce others to take the same views, by quoting Overall's book. Thus Sancroft printed the book for one purpose, and in Sherlock's case it answered another. In all probability Sherlock had begun to repent of his refusal to comply with the new order of things. In my opinion he was looking

[j] Burnet. Both provinces were summoned by royal writ in 1690, though they were not permitted to transact business. Canterbury met in 1695. After various continuations, it was dissolved in 1698. The notices of York arestill slighter. Wilkins, iv. 621, 625.

[k] Sherlock in 1684 had published The Case of Resistance to the Supreme Powers stated and resolved, 8vo, London. He was also the author of A Letter to a Member of the Convocation. Life of Queen Anne, i. 19, 29.

about for a reason to enable him, with some colour of justice, to retrace his steps, and he found it in this Convocation-book. This appears to have been the most remarkable result produced by its publication.[l] Sherlock was actually suspended before he discovered the lawfulness of taking the oaths. He then published his *Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers*, &c., in which he says, "that he had some of the thoughts before;" but he says further, "stick I did, and could find no help for it; and there I should have stuck to this day, had I not been relieved by Bishop Overall's *Convocation-book*." This work was severely attacked by several individuals.[m] The author of the *Review*, in allusion to Overall's book, says, "It is a shrewd sign the doctor was hard put to it, when he caught hold of a twig; yet nothing will serve

[l] Burnet, ii. 212, 213; Welwood, 31; History of the Affair of Dr. Sacheverel, 197. "Upon this King James called a convocation, who prepared a book of canons with relation to the supreme authority; in which, though that of tyrants was carried very far, yet the case of the Maccabees was stated; and they determined that when a new government, though begun in a revolt, is come to a thorow settlement, it may be owned as lawful. Archbishop Sancroft found these canons at Durham under Dr. Overall's hand, and they were published a few days before his suspension." Burnet's Speech,—History of Sacheverell, 197. "There was a paragraph or two that they had not considered." Burnet, ii. 213. The writer of the Review of Sherlock's Case, &c. asks why no notice had been taken of Overall's book, and replies, because "it was of no authority." p. 3. The author of the Second Part of Dr. Sherlock's Two Kings of Brainford, 4to, 1690, says, that on Sherlock's principles the "government was an usurpation, and the Revolution illegal." p. 3. In 1690 appeared the Case of Allegiance to a King in possession, 4to; upon which Sherlock made some remarks; and the writer replied in an Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance, &c. in defence of the Case of Allegiance to a King in possession, 4to, 1691. It was said of Sherlock that he said no more than might be said of any usurper. He offended the nonjurors, and also the friends of William. Calamy, i. 486.

[m] A Review of Dr. Sherlocke's Case of Allegiance, &c. 4to. It is supposed to have been written by Wagstaffe. Sherlock published a Vindication of the Case of Allegiance, in reply to an Answer to a late Pamphlet intituled Obedience and Submission, &c. 4to. An Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Case of Allegiance; this was by Wagstaffe.

him, but it must be the judgment of the Church of England."[n]

But the weapons of satire and ridicule were also used against Sherlock on this occasion. One writer observes, "They were wicked, according to him, who contributed to drive out King James; and yet they are no less wicked who shall in the least contribute to bring him in again." Again: "His scheme of government is calculated for every meridian, nor can any thing happen amiss to him, provided there be but an actual possessor of the supreme power, which 'tis impossible there should want." In allusion to the *Convocation-book*, he says, "That book set him most blessedly at liberty; a pretty fetch to hale in the Church of England to abet his untoward principles."[o]

[n] Sherlock not only refused to take the oaths, but influenced others to follow his example. He discontinued preaching from August 1st, 1689, to Feb. 3, 1689-90, when he resumed his labours, declaring that he had permission from his superiors. A pamphlet was published—the New Nonconformist; or, Dr. Sherlock's Case in Preaching after a Deprivation—in which it was argued that he justified the nonconformists for preaching after the Act of Uniformity, though he had condemned them for so doing. Calamy says, that when Ireland was subdued, he took the oaths; and that the convincing argument was the battle of the Boyne. Calamy, i. 485.

[o] The Trimming Court Divine; or, Reflections on Dr. Sherlock's book on the Lawfulness of swearing Allegiance to the present Government, 1690. The Weesils, a satyrical Fable, giving an account of some argumental Passages happening in the Lion's Court about Weesilion's taking the Oaths, 4to, 1691. The doctor's wife is represented as arguing the point. Thus the argument of the first section explains its character:

Husband and wife at variance are
About the oaths, till female art
Informs his conscience he must swear,
And brings him over to her part.

The doctor is represented as arguing against the oaths on the ground of character. She alludes to some of his writings, which, she says, favour her view. He replies:

Opinions variously the wise endite:
Ne'er build too much on what I write;

Though, therefore, the convocation was silent, the press was fruitful, as is usual on such occasions, in publications on both sides in the controversy.[p]

Burnet, who could not refrain from mixing himself up with the proceedings of the time, incurred great odium with the House of Commons and with many of the people by a pastoral letter written in the year 1689. Thinking that his presence was necessary in London, he put forth a pastoral for his diocese during his absence, in which he asserted the justice of the prince's cause "as heir in remainder," who "has just cause to sue him that is in possession if he make waste in the inheritance." His inference was, that the case was stronger with the heir to a crown, especially "when a pretender was set up." But the obnoxious portion of the letter was that in which he argued that James's right accrued to William "in right of conquest over him."[q] This was so resented by the House of Com-

---

Thou art my own, and I may boldly say,
My pen can travel this and t'other way.

The wife at last says, the doctor having exhorted her to depend on Providence:

But the meantime I want my coach and six;
The neighbouring wives already slight me too,
Justle to the wall, and take the upper pew.

It is scarcely necessary to add, that the doctor yields to the entreaties of his wife, and takes the oaths to King William and Queen Mary. It was written by Brown.

[p] Some of these may be mentioned. Prideaux published a Letter to a Friend relating to the present Convocation, 1689. Long, one of the prebendaries of Exeter, appeared on the opposite side in his Vox Cleri, or the Sense of the Clergy concerning the making Alterations in the Liturgy, &c.; which was answered by Payne in an Answer to Vox Cleri, examining the Reasons against making Alterations, &c. Two other works also appeared against the Vox Cleri, namely Vox Populi, or the Sense of the sober Laymen of England; and Vox Regis et Regni, or a Protest against Vox Cleri. On the other part, Mr. Basset published Two Letters, and a Vindication concerning Alterations; while, in support of the views of the bishops, A Just Censure of Vox Cleri, and Remarks upon the Two Letters, were published. Birch's Tillotson, 209-214.

[q] Pastoral Letter, &c., 1689, 4to, pp. 19-21.

mons, that the book was ordered to be publicly burned by the common hangman. In the year 1693 Burnet republished one of his works written in 1688, in which he explains the obnoxious passage in the pastoral letter, affirming that he only intended a conquest of the late king, not of the nation. Yet he had said almost the same in 1688, in his sermon before the Commons on the 31st of January: "That he with a small force in opposition to a great and powerful army should yet find no enemy, but overturn a mighty empire."[r] Here he certainly speaks of conquering the kingdom. Kennet says that he "did but modestly alledge." For several years no notice was taken of the letter; but in 1693 there appeared a pamphlet supposed to have been written by Blount, *King William and Queen Mary conquerors*, and then the Commons ordered both to be publicly burnt by the common executioner; though this latter seems to have been sacrificed to a poor jest on the author's name.[s]

Tillotson died in 1694; and the funeral sermon, which was preached by Burnet, was published. Burnet mentions his education among the Puritans. "The books which were put into the hands of the youth were generally heavy; he could scarce bear them even before he knew little more; he happily fell in with Chillingworth's book, which gave his mind the ply that it held ever after, and put him on a true scent. He was soon freed from his first prejudices, or rather he was never mastered by them."[t] In this sermon Burnet reflects on Sancroft and his brethren for not

[r] Sermon, &c. pp. 28, 29.

[s] Comp. History, iii. 587, 650. Kennet further states, that some members voted for the burning "for the sake of an allusion to the author's name." The Bishop of St. Asaph, writing to Dodwell in 1695, says that he had "not read the Pastoral Letter, nor did he certainly know why it was burnt." He had heard that it was "because he made this to be a conquered kingdom." Gutch's Coll. ii. 386.

[t] A Sermon preached at the Funeral of the Most Reverend Father in God John, &c. by the Right Reverend Father in God Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum, 1694, 4to, p. 11.

acting at the Revolution, arguing that they ought to have spoken one way or the other."[u] This called forth Hickes in defence of the deprived bishops, who complains of the language used by Burnet. "God be thanked, the main body of our clergy are men of quite different spirits; they do not persecute their old brethren, but pity and help to support them. They know by experience how hard it was for conscience to overcome the difficulties of the new oath, and therefore they retain very tender compassions for those who could not overcome them, and honour them in their hearts." He appeals to the convocation in proof of his assertions. "If any man doubt it, let him consider what inclinations the convocation discovered at its first sitting down."[v] He instances among the clergy Henry Wharton, Dr. Dove, Dr. Scott, and others who were removed into eternity, not mentioning the names of the living. Burnet and Tillotson, he observes, were "men of another spirit; for they revile and persecute their old brethren." Sherlock even, who had long refused the oaths, is charged with urging a magistrate in St. Martin's parish to drive out a meeting of nonjurors; and also with "hunting out their private presses and getting their books seized." In reply to Burnet's remarks on Sancroft's delegation of his powers to his chancellor, Hickes asserts that the bishop did the same thing, refusing to institute a clergyman himself, yet allowing his official to act.[w]

[u] A Sermon, &c. p. 22.

[v] Hickes's Discourses on Burnet and Tillotson, &c., preface.

[w] Ib. Alluding to Sherlock, Hickes says, "if those who took that oath with so much difficulty would but remember their own case, they would have more compassion for those who could not take it at all." Ib. p. 55. In this work Tillotson is charged with giving the elements to persons sitting, at Lincoln's Inn. He states that a lady who had so received the sacrament mentioned the circumstance to one of his friends. It is alleged that he first took the elements to the persons who remained in their seats, and then administered to those who were kneeling at the rails, yet still standing behind them, and not entering within. It is also stated that the Bishop of St. Asaph had administered the elements at Kidder's church to Dr. Bates in the same pos-

A singular circumstance was alleged by some of the writers on convocation to prove how desirable it was that the synod should be permitted to assemble for business. In the year 1698 the Dissenters made an attempt at union among themselves. A circular letter was issued relative to a meeting in London, a copy of which fell into the hands of a clergyman of the same name with the individual for whom it was intended. This clergyman immediately published it with reflections.[x] The letter was sent from Newbury to Oxford, inviting the minister to attend a preliminary meeting at the former place. The author of the reflections contended that the scheme was illegal, inasmuch as it was an attempt to form a national Church, and therefore in contravention of the Act of Submission. His argument assumed this form: if convocation cannot act, much less can they. Calamy mentions the particulars. "A letter from Mr. William Taylor of Newberry to Mr. Sanders, at that time a dissenting minister at Oxford, falling into a wrong hand, it was published in a pamphlet with remarks; and again inserted by Dr. Atterbury in his appendix to a tract of his concerning the rights, powers, and privileges of an English convocation. But that writer much overdid it in saying that 'they of the Presbyterial congregational way have their convocation in as regular and full, though not in so open a manner, as the members of the Church of England desire to have, as appears from that circular summons which about eighteen months ago was issued out, and casually came into a hand that it did not belong to.'"[y] Atterbury, however, makes no complaint, but merely adduces the fact, to prove that all religious bodies are under the necessity of meeting together to deliberate on their affairs;

ture. Ib. 73. In the appendix to this work, no. viii., is an account of the seizure of several of the private printing-presses of the nonjurors, with a list of the works which were taken in the offices.

[x] Some Reflections on a Model now in projection by the Presbyterian Dissenters, with a Circular Letter intimating it. 1698, 4to.

[y] Calamy's Historical Account, &c. i. 408.

adding, that even the Quakers had their yearly meetings.[z]

Tenison succeeded Tillotson in 1694.[a] Like his predecessor, he advised the crown not to permit the convocation to act.[b] At length, those who held the views of the majority of the lower house in 1689 became impatient of the restraint imposed by the crown. They complained that it was unjust not to allow the convocation to sit; nor can it be denied, whatever their conduct may have been, that they had at all events the appearance of justice on their side. Under these circumstances appeared the celebrated *Letter to a Convocation Man*, 4to, 1697. The writer, after some reflections on the king and the archbishop, and certain allusions to the Church of Scotland, affirms that the convocation has a right, not only to meet every session of parliament, but to sit and transact business without the royal license. This point, therefore, was the hinge on which the future controversy mainly depended. It was considered, on the one side, that the convocation was restrained by the Act of Submission from proceeding to treat of matters ecclesiastical, without express permission or license from the crown. This doctrine, which had been believed and acted on since the Reformation, was now denied in the *Letter* in question. On the other side, therefore, it was urged that convocations met in obedience to

[z] Atterbury's Rights, &c. pp. 26, 506, 507.

[a] Tillotson died poor. "Splendide pauper obiit, nihil fere suis, præter scriptorum famam et hæreditatem relinquens." Godwin, de Præsul. 166. In 1690 the fast-day seems to have been neglected by many of the clergy. The anonymous author of a Fast Sermon, already quoted, says that James II. could not stop the clergy "from commemorating the 5th of November's deliverance," while the day now appointed was not only not observed, but treated with contempt, p. 29.

[b] "After he with great moderation had governed the Church for three years, a misfortune befel him which he was not aware of. The occasion whereof did proceed from hence, that he, following the steps of Dr. Tillotson and several others of his predecessors (no license being granted by the court for the transacting of business), did continue the convocations by moderate prorogations without sitting." Nichols's Defence, 126.

the archbishop's summons, which of course depended on the prince; that they were prorogueable at his pleasure; and that they could not act without his license.[c]

This work was answered by Wake,[d] who combats the proposition of the *Letter*, and, by a large induction of particulars, he shews that Christian princes ever had the right to call synods, and to regulate their proceedings, until it was wrested from them by the pope. He claims for our sovereigns the power only which was exercised by Christian princes in the early periods of the Church. He also appeals to the Act of Submission as a proof that the clergy cannot treat of ecclesiastical matters without the royal permission. During the same year another work was published by Wright, who took the same view with Wake.[e] He was a lawyer; and it is worthy of observation that the author of the *Letter* professes to be a lawyer, though such was not the case, Dr. Binkes being a clergyman.

Wake was soon answered by Hill, in *Municipium Ecclesiasticum*, in which he is charged with betraying the rights

[c] Letter to a Convocation Man; Biog. Brit., art. Atterbury. Tindal's Cont. iii. 523, who strangely ascribes the letter to Atterbury, whereas it was written by Dr. Binkes. Atterbury's Correspondence, ii. 25. Ib. iii. 71.

[d] The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods, 8vo, 1697.

[e] A Letter to a Member of Parliament, occasioned by a Letter to a Convocation Man. London, 1697, 4to.

[f] Kennet's Synods, 19. The letter is ascribed to Sir Bartholomew Shower. Somers Tracts, xi. 363. It is evident, from the notice to the reader respecting the list of *errata*, that the author resided in the country. "The author's distance from the press may have occasioned other mistakes, which the reader is desired to correct or excuse." A person residing in London would not have offered such an excuse. The name of Sir Bartholomew Shower is given in the Somers Tracts without remark, and apparently intended to be considered as a part of the title. The volume of tracts in which this work is contained was published in 1751, a time when little attention was paid to such matters. Probably some one had written the name on the tract in the possession of Lord Somers, and it was printed without inquiry; but such evidence can avail nothing against the general opinion entertained during the convocation controversy from 1697 to the reign of George I.

of the Church. In 1698 Wake published another work, in which Hill's arguments are noticed.[h]

But the most powerful antagonist of Wake was Atterbury.[i] Wake is attacked with great severity, Atterbury taking the ground which had been occupied in the *Letter to a Convocation Man.* To give an abstract even of these works is not possible within the compass of a single volume. The reader who wishes to prosecute the inquiry will find himself abundantly rewarded by their perusal.[j]

If Atterbury went too far in one direction, Wake was certainly at this time inclined to the opposite extreme. After reading Wake's *Authority of Christian Princes,* Nicolson says, that he noticed some things "as seemingly new, and what, I fancy, will be disputed." He asks whether the lawyers will not be angry "when they observe you

[h] An Appeal to all True Members of the Church of England in behalf of the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy. 8vo. Hill was answered in a Brief Enquiry into the Ground, Authority, and Rights of Ecclesiastical Synods. 8vo, 1699.

[i] The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation stated and vindicated, in answer to a late book of Dr. Wake's, entitled, &c. 8vo, 1700.

[j] Leslie says, "to Atterbury's book we chiefly owe the present convocation." Case of the Regale, pref. p. x. Nicolson says, May 3, 1700, "The author is not certainly known here. I am apt to believe it must be somebody whom you have disgusted, by giving him too free or too slender a character in your book." Nicolson's Correspondence, I. 183. Nichols says, of his Records: "he illustrated them with such pleasant lights, and seasoned them with such delicate salts of wit, as made this rough and dry subject to be received with pleasure. Upon this account the generality of the clergy do very earnestly desire that a convocation might at last sit." Nichols's Defence, 130. It is singular that Wake, writing in May 1700, about Atterbury's book, says, "I need not tell you, that the world is as full of Mr. Atterbury's book as I left it at Oxford. In this all agree, that it was writ with a hearty good will, and may be a pattern for charity and good breeding. Nicolson, I. 182. He soon changed his opinion. Nicolson says that Atterbury's "materials were collected by Dr. Hutton of Aynhoe; but they were put together by a pert gentleman of Christ Church." Correspondence, i. 174, 175. Gough mentions that Hutton left twenty volumes of Ms. collections from the Registers of York and Wells, which came into the hands of Wharton. Three volumes are in the Harleian collection. Gough's Topography, ii. 422.

make logic one thing and law another, and affirm (what most others deny) that the canons of 1640 are as valid as those of 1603. The Church, you say, has no inherent right of assembling synods. How will this agree with the convocation being essential to our constitution, and when (manifestly needful) the Church has a right to its sitting? Are you not too severe upon the members of our present convocation, when you give such broad hints at their being warm and unthinking, and having their very reason depraved; and when you affirm that a convocation, at liberty to treat freely, would be a remedy worse than the disease?"[k] These passages were written before Atterbury's reply made its appearance; and certainly, if Nicolson, with his moderate views, was staggered at some of the positions, we cannot be surprised at the strong language used by Wake's opponents. When Atterbury's work appeared, Nicolson found himself attacked in consequence of his remarks on convocation in his *Historical Library*.

In the year 1700 the convocation was permitted to meet for business; and its proceedings will shew that the members were influenced by the views of the one or the other party in the controversy already mentioned. The convocation of Canterbury met on the 10th of February. The sermon was preached by Dr. Haley, dean of Chichester; and Dr. Hooper, dean of Canterbury, was chosen prolocutor.[l] On the 25th the archbishop's schedule for proroguing the convocation was sent to the lower house;

[k] Nicolson's Correspondence, i. 66, 67. There is a curious letter among the Lambeth Mss. from the Bishop of Norwich to the archbishop, in which he expresses his hope, in the year 1700, that no license may be granted for business; "for if there should be, it will be thought the effect of Mr. Atterbury's book. But if a good answer to that book shall precede the sitting of convocation, persons will probably meet with more settled and easy minds." Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 41.

[l] Atterbury explains why Jane was not chosen. He had been ill, and had signified his inability; but recovering, he intended to take the office, if chosen. Meanwhile Hooper had been agreed upon, and Jane supported and presented him to the archbishop. Atterbury Corres. iii. 28, 29.

but, contrary to the previous practice, they continued their sessions, and proceeded with some unimportant matters, in order to bring the question relative to the right of the archbishop to prorogue to an issue. The custom had always been for the archbishop to sign a *schedule*, by which the upper house was immediately adjourned, it was then sent to the prolocutor, and the lower house was considered as prorogued. Now, however, the archbishop's right was disputed. They insisted on the right of adjourning themselves, in a paper which was afterwards laid before the bishops. After sitting some time to assert their right, the prolocutor signified an adjournment by consent, to meet in Henry VII.'s Chapel, though the archbishop had fixed the Jerusalem Chamber. On the 28th, the day fixed in the schedule, when the bishops assembled, the clergy did not attend, as had always been the practice. Under these circumstances the prolocutor was summoned. The following questions were proposed by the archbishop:—first, "Whether the lower house did sit after they were prorogued on the 25th?" Secondly, "Whether they did meet this morning without attending in this place to which they were prorogued?" The prolocutor replied that they were preparing something on the subject to submit to the upper house.

The archbishop issued another schedule; and, to prevent any dispute as to the place of meeting, these words were inserted, "*in hunc locum, vulgo vocatum Jerusalem Chamber.*" The lower house submitted on this occasion with a *salvo jure*. On the 6th of March, accordingly, the prolocutor and some of the members attended, in obedience to the *schedule*. A committee of the clergy had been appointed to search the convocation-books for directions on the question in dispute. In the report which was drawn up, it was stated that the custom had been to continue sitting until prorogued by the prolocutor, and that the lower house did not always adjourn at the same time with the other; secondly, that the usage had been for the lower

house to meet in the place where they had last sat, and not where the archbishop might appoint; that it had not been the practice to attend their lordships before proceeding to business; and that it had only been the custom to wait on the bishops when they had matters to transact, or were summoned by a special messenger.[m]

A direct answer was expected by the bishops to the questions proposed. The paper was read, and its examination referred to a committee. An answer was afterwards returned by the bishops, "in which," says Burnet, "all their precedents were examined and answered, and the matter was so clearly stated and so fully proved, that we hoped we had put an end to the dispute."[n] At the same time the president delivered to the prolocutor the *form* of an address to the king. A single amendment, namely, the substitution of the words *reformed Churches* for *reformed religion*, was made by the lower and accepted by the upper house; after which the address was presented. It must be admitted that the amendment was an improvement. They thanked the king for the protection which he had granted, and for his pious regard for the reformed Churches in general. They also express their determination to maintain the royal supremacy, and the articles and canons of the Church. An answer was returned by his majesty.[o]

In the next session, March 20th, the prolocutor brought up a representation respecting certain books, and solicited the advice of the upper house. The book, to which special exception was taken, was Toland's *Christianity not mysterious*, which had been submitted to the lower house by the vice-chancellor of Oxford. Certain resolutions, condemnatory of the book, were passed by the lower house, to which was appended a schedule of positions extracted

[m] Comp. Hist. iii. 800, 801; Tindal's Cont. iii. 525, 526; Calamy, i 573, 574; Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 44, 45; Tenison's Life, 78-81.

[n] Burnet, ii. 282, 283.

[o] Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 36; Tenison's Life, 82; Comp. Hist. 801, 802.

from the same work. These papers were laid before the upper house.[p]

On the 22d of March the archbishop produced a book, entitled *Essays on the Balance of Power*. In this work the author asserted, that persons had been promoted in the Church who were remarkable for nothing but enmity to the divinity of Christ. The bishops, therefore, agreed that a paper should be affixed to the doors of Westminster Abbey, calling upon the author to make good his assertions, in order that the parties might be proceeded against; otherwise the passage in question to be voted a public scandal.[q]

Burnet says, "They brought up the censure to the bishops, and desired them to agree to their resolutions. This struck so directly at episcopal authority, that it seemed strange to see men who had so long asserted the divine right of episcopacy, and that presbyters were only their assistants and council, now assume to themselves the most important act of Church government, the judging in points of doctrine."[r] Burnet's remark, however, was unnecessary, for the lower house merely presented a representation to the bishops; and surely this act was quite within their province.

The lower house voted, on the 31st of March, that they

[p] Wilkins, iv. 630, 631; Comp. Hist. iii. 802. The books had been considered in a committee. Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 36, 37. Toland wrote a letter to Hooper in his defence. Vindicius Liberius, pp. 13-28. Hooper replied, that his business was only to preside as moderator. Toland wrote again; but he says that the papers were not communicated to the house, so that he thought they were satisfied. Ib. 29-33. It must be admitted that the books, of which the lower house of convocation complained, were of a most obnoxious character. They were widely circulated by the enemies of the Church; and it cannot be denied that the bishops, from whatever cause, were reluctant to proceed against the authors.

[q] Comp. Hist. iii. 802; Calamy, i. 575; Wilkins, iv. 631; Vindicius Liberius, 64, 65. The Balance of Power was written by Davenant. Evelyn, iii. 388.

[r] Burnet, ii. 283.

had a right to adjourn themselves. A message was sent to the bishops to this effect, that they had considered their lordships' reply to their paper, and that it was unsatisfactory. They asked, therefore, for a free conference. After the prolocutor had retired, the bishops proceeded to discuss the matter proposed by the clergy; and on their return the archbishop informed them that, as they had replied to their paper in writing, they also expected a written answer from the lower house. The prolocutor remarked that their answer would occupy twenty sheets; upon which the archbishop replied, that he "did not confine them to length and breadth, but expected their answer in writing."[s]

Still the lower house refused to return a written answer, and persisted in their demand for a free conference. They drew up a long paper in writing, containing their reasons for not returning a written reply to the paper from the upper house. They again asserted their right of adjourning themselves, and requested a free conference. It was presented on the 5th of April.[t]

In the mean time the bishops proceeded with the business connected with Toland's book. They resolved to consult precedents as their guide. Something similar had occurred in 1689. The lower house had complained of certain books; the archbishop declared them to be pernicious, but stated at the same time that he did not know what were the powers of convocation in such cases. Law-

[s] Comp. Hist. iii. 842.

[t] Comp. Hist. iii. 842; Burnet, ii. 283, who says that some in the lower house had no end in view but to force themselves into preferment by their opposition. "My lords the bishops intend to give in their answer to our report about prorogations and adjournments; and we are told that they intend to stick firmly to their present practice, that is, neither to let us go to prayers when we meet till we have attended at Jerusalem Chamber and they are sat, nor yet let us sit at all after they rise. If so, we shall certainly adhere, and perhaps break upon that point; for the right is manifestly with us, though it be determined not to allow it to us." Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 42.

yers were consulted, however; and the result was, that, as the law stood, the authors of the books might be prosecuted, but that the convocation could not interfere. Such was the view in 1689. A committee of bishops was appointed to examine Toland's book, who reported that it was of dangerous tendency. Having the results of a similar proceeding in 1689 before them, they resolved to take the opinion of counsel on the point before they advanced further. Two questions were proposed: first, whether giving an opinion in convocation concerning a book that it is immoral and impious is contrary to any law; secondly, whether the words in the affixed paper are such an opinion as is contrary to any law. On receiving the answer, the bishops drew up a paper for the lower house, in which they state that, having consulted counsel, they could not censure such books judicially without a license from the king, which they had not received; and that were they to do so, they might incur the penalties of the statute of the 25th Henry VIII.[u]

On the 8th of April the bishops returned their reply to the paper of the lower house of the 5th, stating that they must maintain the ancient constitution of the Church; that while they regarded the rights of the lower house, they could not relinquish their own; that after searching the registers, they could not but declare that the proceedings of the lower house were irregular; and that they were surprised that an answer had not been given to the paper in question. After the answer had been read, and copies delivered to the clergy, the archbishop prorogued the convocation in a speech in which he alluded to the proceedings of the lower house. The following are extracts:—

"We have many enemies, and they wait for nothing more than to see the union and order of this Church,

[u] Wilkins, iv. 631; Comp. Hist. 843; Burnet, ii. 284. Burnet says that Northey, who was afterwards attorney-general, thought the matter to be of great consequence, since by condemning some things and approving others, they might alter the doctrine of the Church.

which is both its beauty and its strength, broken by those who ought to preserve it."

"For the maintaining the episcopal authority is so necessary to the preservation of the Church, that the rest of the clergy are no less concerned in it than the bishops themselves."

"I have thought fit, with the rest of my brethren, to prorogue the convocation for some time. It is a season of devotion, and I pray God it may have a good effect on all our minds."

"We, on our part, are willing to forget all that is past, and to go on with you at our next meeting, as well as at all times, with all tenderness and parental affection, in all such things as shall conduce to the good of this Church."[v]

They were prorogued until the 8th of May; but the prolocutor, with some of the clergy, returning to Henry VII.'s Chapel, continued to sit as a house for some time, and then adjourned themselves until the next day. Many of the clergy retired from the party in opposition to the bishops. "It was an affection of independence that was unknown to former convocations, and never before attempted by any presbyters in any episcopal Church."[w]

At the next meeting, May 8, the archbishop told the clergy that their proceedings, in holding sessions after the prorogation, were irregular, and that they could not receive any thing that had been done in the interval. The prolocutor, holding a paper in his hand, replied: "I am commanded by the lower house to bring up this paper, and I do present it as the act of the house this day." The paper was then laid on the table, as an answer to the paper delivered to the lower house on the 8th of April, the day of the prorogation. In this document they remark that

[v] Comp. Hist. iii. 844.

[w] Ibid. iii. 845; Tindal's Cont. iii. 527, 528. Nichols, who is exceedingly impartial, says of this prorogation: "This being a very long prorogation, so irritated the lower house, that, to the admiration of all men, by their own authority they adjourn their session to a different day." Defence, 132.

the archbishop might have obtained a license to proceed in the case of Toland's book. An answer was prepared by a committee, in which the bishops state that they had condemned Toland's book, but had deemed it right to be guided in their proceedings by precedents; that royal licenses had always been granted *ex mero motu*, and not on petitions; and that it could not be expected, considering the treatment of the former *license*, that another would be granted until a better spirit prevailed; and that the bishop of the diocese in which Toland resided might proceed against the author. After some allusions to the proceedings of the lower house in their separate adjournments, their claiming a distinct recess, and some other matters, the bishops add, "which, together with some reports raised upon 'em, have given the greatest blow to this Church that hath been given it since the Presbyterian Assembly that sat at Westminster in the late times of confusion."[x]

In order to come to an amicable arrangement, the bishops appointed a committee of five, to meet a similar number from the lower house, for the purpose of examining the acts of the present synod, and to report upon them. To this pacific proposal the lower house replied that they should not nominate any committee. When the schedule of prorogation, by which the convocation was adjourned until the 18th of May, was delivered to the prolocutor to signify to the clergy, he refused to make any intimation of it, and took upon himself to adjourn the house unto the next day. Some of the members were much distressed at such a course. They therefore resolved to address the archbishop on the subject; and on the 16th of May, the day fixed in the schedule, a paper was presented to the president, in which the clergy who signed it beg of his grace not to interpret their absence as a mark of disrespect to himself, since it was occasioned by the fact, that the prorogation was not intimated to the lower house by the

[x] Comp. Hist. iii. 845.

prolocutor. It was signed by several members, among whom were Beveridge and Sherlock.[y]

To evince their opposition still more, the lower house proceeded to attack the work of Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles. It may appear strange to us, now that the reputation of the work has been so fully, and for such a length of time, established, that a large body of influential clergymen should have concurred in a vote of censure. Yet such was actually the case. They drew up a *Representation of their Sense upon the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, which was presented to the upper house on the 30th of May.[z] The archbishop replied, "If you have any thing to offer, we cannot receive it till the late irregularity of refusing to meet the committee of bishops to inspect the books of this convocation be set right." A copy of the archbishop's speech was presented to the prolocutor, who retired, and after a short space returned to the room adjoining the Jerusalem Chamber. The Bishop of Bangor, by direction of the archbishop, went out to ask "whether the message he was now to bring was to set the irregularity complained of right?" On his return the bishop reported that the prolocutor said, at first, "that it was something in order to set that irregularity right," and that then, recollecting and correcting himself, he said, "it was concerning that irregularity." Upon this answer being reported, the prolocutor and his attendants were introduced, when the archbishop stated

[y] Comp. Hist. iii. 845, 846.

[z] "And some of the other side were so fond of complaining, that they made as heavy a complaint against the Bishop of Sarum's Comment upon the XXXIX. Articles — a book which for the generality deserves all the praise that can be given it — as they did against the atheistical writings, without any other reason to countenance such a terrible charge, but that he was unacceptable to their side." Nichols's Defence, 131. The author of the "Expedient Proposed" says that the "lower house suspected Burnet of screening Toland in the upper house; and that so they attack his book." Toland, however, says, that he was one of the committee of bishops who found dangerous positions in his book. Vindicius Liberius, 70, 71.

that they were willing to receive any thing connected with setting right the irregularity. The prolocutor said that it was something concerning it. He then began to read a paper, which referred, not to the irregularity, but to Burnet's *Exposition of the Articles.*

The archbishop and bishops were taken by surprise by the course pursued by the prolocutor; and the Bishop of Bangor proceeded to state again what had passed between them in the adjoining room. He even charged Dr. Hooper, the prolocutor, with prevarication, in having asserted that the paper did refer to the irregularity.

The paper, therefore, which the prolocutor wished to present, was their complaint of Burnet's work, entitled *A Representation of the Lower House of Convocation.* It stated, that a book had been published by the Bishop of Sarum, which the author had declared to have been sanctioned by several bishops. Their complaints were arranged under the following heads, and the reader will be curious to see them, in consequence of the popularity of the work to which they refer.

"1. That the said book tends to introduce such a latitude and diversity of opinions, as the Articles were framed to avoid.

"2. That there are many passages in the exposition of several Articles, which appear to us to be contrary to the true meaning of them, and to other received doctrines of our Church.

"3. That there are some things in the said book which seem to us to be of dangerous consequence to the Church of England as by law established, and to derogate from the honour of its reformation.

"All which particulars we humbly lay before your lordships, praying your opinion herein."

When the prolocutor had withdrawn, the bishops proceeded to discuss the matter. After a short space the prolocutor was called in, and informed that they could not depart from their former resolution not to receive any

thing from the lower house until the late irregularity was set right. Some of the clergy did not concur in this hasty measure of the majority, and just at this juncture they appeared with a complaint in writing, in which they protested against all that had taken place in the intermediate sessions. The protestation states, that they had been prevented from entering a protest in their own house, and they begged to be permitted to do so to the bishops. It was signed by *thirteen* individuals, among whom were Sherlock and Bull.[a]

At the next session, June 6th, the archbishop told the prolocutor that they could not receive any thing from the lower house until the irregularity was set right. He stated, however, that the Bishop of Sarum had requested them to receive their *Representation* respecting his *Exposition*, and that, in consequence of that request, they would receive it, but without prejudice to their former order. The prolocutor now replied, that the paper in his hand was not that on the Bishop of Sarum's book, but a paper concerning the irregularity. He was requested to procure the other, while the present was read by the register. In the document now presented, the clergy stated that they considered themselves at liberty to admit or decline the appointment of a committee; that they could see no ground for such a committee; but that still they should have complied, had not their lordships expressed their opinion, that all that was transacted in their house between the 8th of April and the 8th of May was of dangerous consequence. They prayed, therefore, that the bishops would lay aside their resolution, and restore the communication between the two houses.

This paper was referred to a committee, who made a report to the house; after which the bishops replied, that what had been done was agreeable to the practice of former convocations, and that when the point was disputed,

[a] Comp. Hist. iii. 846, 847; Burnet, ii. 284, 285.

they proposed a committee to inspect the acts and registers, to which the clergy refused to assent; a thing unprecedented in the history of the Church. They also added, that by such refusal the lower house had departed from the usual practice, broken the subordination to their metropolitan and bishops, and interrupted the intercourse between the two houses; that they might have proceeded against them for contempt by canonical admonitions, but that they called it by the milder term, an *irregularity*. They repeat, therefore, that until the lower house return to their duty, they cannot proceed to business with them, or receive communications from them. In allusion to the notion entertained by the lower house, that they could sit and act alone, the bishops remark, that it is a mistake, since the convocation is but one body, meeting first in one place, the archbishop being president; that though a particular place is assigned for their debates, they are yet compelled to attend the archbishop's call, and that both houses are continued and prorogued by one instrument. They further declared, that all the proceedings of the intermediate sessions were null and void; and they conclude with an expression of hope, that the lower house would consider of their irregularity, and remove the obstruction to the regular transaction of business.[b]

The prolocutor now brought up their *Representation* on Burnet's *Exposition*, when he was told by the archbishop that the complaint contained only generals, and that particulars must be specified. On the retirement of the prolocutor, it was supposed that the clergy were about to prepare a particular charge against Burnet's work. Some time having elapsed, a messenger was sent to make the inquiry whether they had any thing in readiness to present respecting the work in question. They replied that they were preparing business, but that it was not yet ready. Upon the receipt of this answer, the archbishop prorogued the convocation to the 13th of June.

But in the mean time a committee of bishops had

[b] Comp. Hist. iii. 847-849.

come to the following resolution respecting Burnet's *Exposition*.

First, in relation to the complaint and censure of the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles made by the lower house, and presented to the archbishop and bishops on May 30th, 1701,—

"1. It is our opinion that the lower house of convocation has no manner of power judicially to censure any book.

"2. That the lower house of convocation ought not to have entered on the examination of a book of any bishop of this Church, without first acquainting the president and bishops with it.

"3. That the lower house of convocation censuring the book of the Bishop of Sarum in general terms, without mentioning the particular passages on which the censure is grounded, is defamatory and scandalous.

"4. That the Bishop of Sarum, by his excellent *History of the Reformation*, approved by both houses of parliament, and other writings, hath done great service to the Church of England, and justly deserves the thanks of this house.

"5. That though private persons may expound the Articles of the Church, yet it cannot be proper for the convocation at this time to approve, and much less to condemn, such private exposition."

In the second part of their declaration, the bishops referred to the complaint which had been raised by the prolocutor against the Bishop of Bangor, respecting his report of the conversation between them on a previous occasion, in the room adjoining the Jerusalem Chamber. They justify the Bishop of Bangor.

Then, in the third place, they express their approbation of the course pursued by those who had protested against the proceedings of the lower house. They further state that the prolocutor and some other members had been guilty of contempt and disobedience.[c]

[c] Tenison's Life, 83-91; Comp. Hist. iii. 849, 850.

At the next session, on the 20th of June, as soon as prayers were ended, the prolocutor, accompanied by the majority of the members of the lower house, appeared, holding in his hand two papers. The archbishop stated that no paper would be received except that which contained the particulars of the charge against the Bishop of Sarum's book. To this the prolocutor replied, that he had two papers, but that, without instructions, he could not present the one without the other. He added, that he would return and obtain the opinion of the house. However, he did not return; and the convocation was prorogued to the 7th of August, then to the 18th of September, till it was at length dissolved with the parliament.[d]

In the province of York no business had been transacted in this convocation.

Atterbury had reprinted his work on the convocation during the year 1700, just as the parliament assembled, and had corrected several mistakes into which he had fallen, fearing lest the errors should be detected by others. As has been remarked already, Atterbury's object was to prove that the convocation had a right to sit and act without any express permission from the Crown, beyond the writ by which they were assembled.[e]

Kennet was one of Atterbury's ablest antagonists.[f] His work, which was now published, is remarkable for its moderation. It appears, that most of the bad feeling

[d] Comp. Hist. iii. 850; Calamy, i. 608, 609; Tindal's Cont. iii. 529; Tenison's Life, 91.

[e] Tindal's Cont. iii. 524; Burnet, ii. 285. Atterbury's work now appeared with his name, and a dedication to the bishops, with large additions, which were also printed separately for those who had the previous edition. In the preface he speaks most contemptuously of Wake. The controversy, says Nichols, when he wrote, is "not yet laid asleep, altho' the contention between these learned persons is become the jest of the common people." He mentions that peaceable men who joined neither party were hated by both. Defence, 133. Kennet charged Atterbury with unfairness in his second edition, for making alterations not given in the *Addenda* as he had promised.

[f] Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of

in this controversy was on the side of those who supported the views of the majority of the lower house. Kennet dwells especially on these points, namely, that anciently there were two kinds of assemblies in this country, those which were purely ecclesiastical, and those which were of a parliamentary character; that for ages the clergy came to convocation merely to attend the bishops; that they came to the parliamentary assemblies to grant subsidies; and that in the end, the men who were summoned to parliament were summoned at the same time to a provincial synod concurrent with the parliament; and that the writ by which they were called to the synod was different from that which was in the summons of the bishops.[g]

The author of an anonymous work complains that Atterbury's design had been to state his opponent's views unfairly, and to answer what he had never advanced. Other works were published on both sides in this controversy.[h]

During the present convocation, new subjects of debate had arisen respecting the right of the archbishop to adjourn the lower house, and other points, which have al-

England, historically stated and justly vindicated from the Misrepresentations of Mr. Atterbury, 8vo, 1701. Kennet's work was announced at first under a different title; indeed the title was several times changed. At one time it stood thus: The Divine Right of Convocations examined. It was announced first on the 4th of January, 1700-1701, altered on the 29th, and again on the 6th of February. Nicholson's Correspondence, i. 215, 216. 221, 222.

[g] Atterbury made some quotations from Colet's sermon in 1511, which led to a republication with Smith's preface of 1661. It was "humbly offered to the present convocation." Smith's edition of 1661 is valuable for the notes. Atterbury had spoken severely of Burnet, who replied in Reflections on a Book intituled, &c. 4to, 1700. Biog. Brit. i. 267.

[h] The Principles of Mr. Atterbury's Book, and his Arguments against Dr Wake and others, stated and examined; Some Remarks upon the temper of the late Writers about Convocations, particularly Dr. Wake, Dr. Kennet, and the Author of Mr. Atterbury's Principles; The Rights, Liberties, and Authorities of the Christian Church asserted against all oppressive Doctrines and Constitutions, 8vo, 1701. The last was written by Hill. This and the preceding are in favour of Atterbury's views.

ready been detailed in this chapter. As a matter of course, the controversy was carried on by means of the press as well as in the convocation. Kennet published an occasional *Letter on English Convocations*, in which the right of the archbishop is defended.[1]

[1] Kennet's Life, 20. Kennet admits that the archbishop would allow committees during prorogations. Occasional Letter, pp. 59, 60. Other works appeared in quick succession. A Letter to a Friend in the Country concerning the Proceedings in the present Convocation. This was written by Gibson, who took an active part in the discussion. Biog. Brit. art. Atterbury. Atterbury replied in a pamphlet, The Power of the Lower House of Convocation to adjourn itself, vindicated from the Misrepresentations of a late Paper. A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation relating to Prorogations and Adjournments from Monday, February 10th, to Wednesday, June 25th, 1701, drawn up by order of the House. This was drawn up by Hooper, assisted by Aldrich. Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 49, 50. The Narrative was the official record of their proceedings, and, of course, an attempt at justification. The History of the Convocation was drawn up from the journal of the upper house, and from the narrative and minutes of the lower house. Kennet's Life, p. 20; Calamy, i. 609. A Letter to the author of the Narrative was published, written, says Atterbury, "very craftily and skilfully." The Letter to a Clergyman was Atterbury's reply. The Case of the Præmunientes was an answer to Atterbury, who wrote a Third Letter to a Clergyman, to which was published an Answer to a Third Letter. Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 52, 56, 58, 75. He mentions that 1500 copies of The Power of the Lower House were sold; but he complains of the inactivity of his friends. Jane sent for 40 copies: "None of our other great men here have been pleased to give any manner of encouragement." Ib. 50, 51. On the archbishop's side it was argued that he could continue the convocation at pleasure. It is, however, admitted that he consults his suffragans about the day of meeting; then the form is made out, called the schedule of continuation, which is signed and sent to the prolocutor, to intimate to the lower house. It was argued that no business could take place on intermediate days without the archbishop's permission. The Right of the Archbishop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation, 4to, 1701, pp. 37, 38, 80, 81, 114; A Letter to the Author of the Narrative; A Letter to a Clergyman in the country, concerning the choice of Members, and the execution of the Parliament Writ for the ensuing Convocation; The Case of the Præmunientes considered; A Reply to the Letter to a Clergyman; and a Third Letter to a Clergyman. The History of the Convocation was written by Kennet. A faithful Account of what passed in Convocation, in Three Letters; and an Expedient proposed in answer to the Right of the Archbishop to prorogue the whole Convocation asserted. The latter was written by Binkes. Atterbury, iii. 61. The views of the majority in the lower house were ad-

At this time a work of more importance by Hody also made its appearance.[j] Hody takes the same views with Wake; and the work is managed with great ability and moderation.

I have now noticed most of the volumes on the convocation, down to the year 1701, which I have carefully examined; and though the detail may be comparatively uninteresting in the estimation of some persons, yet it is not possible to present a clear view of the subject without a reference to the works published at the time by parties engaged in the controversy.

vocated in these two publications, though with much moderation in the latter, which was answered in A Letter to the Author of the pretended Expedient, in which the writer says that the expedient must begin in owning the authority of the metropolitan and his suffragans. The same work was also commented on in Reflections on a late Paper, intituled An Expedient Proposed.

[j] A History of English Councils and Convocations, and of the Clergy sitting in Parliament; in which is also comprehended the History of Parliaments, with an Account of our ancient Laws. By Humphrey Hody, D.D., 1701, 8vo. Trimnell wrote A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Lower House, &c. 4to, 1701; The Pretence to enter the Parliament Writ detected, 4to, 1701; An Answer to a Third Letter to a Clergyman, &c. 4to, 1702; Partiality Detected, &c. Biog. Brit. sup. art. Trimnell. The last is assigned to Bishop Moore in Opinions of Sir F. Thesiger, Sir W. Page Wood, and Dr. R. Phillimore, &c.

CHAPTER XII.

A.D. 1701.

Convocation, 1701 — Disputes revived — Prorogation — Death of King William — Reflections on the disputes — Works on the subject — Controversy on Burnet's Exposition — Queen Anne — Convocation, 1702 — Controversy revived — Lower House sign a Declaration respecting Episcopacy — Their conduct examined — Lower House petition the Queen — Bishops' Reply to Declaration — Prorogation — Convocation, 1703 — Representation of the Lower House — Queen Anne's Bounty — Prorogation — State-services — Convocation Controversy — Wake's State — Complaints of Lower House — New Convocation, 1705 — Disputes on the Address — The Queen's Letter on their Differences — Prorogation — Review of Papers presented by Lower House — Convocation, 1707 — Union with Scotland — Lower House complain — Absence of the Prolocutor — Dissolution.

THE new convocation was opened on the 31st of December, the Latin service having been read by the Bishop of Oxford, and the sermon preached by the Dean of St. Paul's. "After the king's writ had been read, and the Bishop of London's certificate, the archbishop admonished the clergy to retire into the chapel at the west end of the church, where morning prayers are usually sayd, and there, under the conduct of the Dean of Paul's, to choose a prolocutor, and present him in Hen. VII. chapel, on Tuesday y^e^ 13 Jan." The Dean of St. Paul's took the chair, and in a speech told the occasion of their meeting. "The Dean of Canterbury and others insisted on proxy votes. We answered, there had never been any such custom, nor could there be any right or reason in it; for the absent were already pronounced contumacious, and till their absence was excused by the judge, who had so pronounced y^m^, they lay under a canonical impediment." In the election of a prolocutor, 30 votes were given for Beveridge, and 36 or 37 for Woodward. "They then moved for putting y^e^

prolocutor into y^e^ chair, and Dr Woodward pressed toward it. We urged it to be irregular, and an innovation for the prolocutor to take y^e^ chair, and seem to preside over a house when we were yet no house, and when the whole convocation was prorogued. The Dean of Paul's kept possession of the chair, and prevented the intrusion of Dr. Woodward, till by degrees the company went away." Tuesday, January 13, they met in Henry VII.'s chapel: prayers were read by the Bishop of Oxford, and the prolocutor was presented by the Dean of Canterbury. "The prolocutor elect made another speech, and in military terms: *Trajecto Rubicone, dextro Hercule, gregari milites.* The archbishop, sitting, read an excellent speech, exhorting to unity and peace, reproving the unhappy divisions in the last convocation, and mentioning this only good effect of them, that it had occasioned the industry of some learned and valuable men who had now inquired into those matters too much before unknown, and had set them in such due light, that all persons might be satisfied in the rights and customs of holding our convocations." The prolocutor and clergy were then ordered to withdraw to the consistory at the west end of the church. Soon after the schedule of prorogation was sent to the prolocutor, who said that he had received a paper, and that he would mention its contents: "a paper by which their lordships had adjourned themselves." To this it was replied, that nothing was said of adjourning, and that there was no such thing, but an act of proroguing the whole synod "made by the archbishop with consent of his suffragans bishops. The Dean of Canterbury reply'd, that it was an act only of the upper house; at which I could not but smile." The dean replied, that he could convince the member of the soundness of the position, which the other said was impossible. "We moved that the schedule might be read; but the prolocutor would not read it, but at last gave it to the actuary to read, which we thought a contempt of the schedule." At last the prolocutor, "seeming to intimate it,

said, &c. *in hunc locum, &c.* I took occasion to say, that I was very sorry I must again complain of this unfair way of reporting the schedule by obtruding a phrase *in hunc locum*, which was not in the schedule, but another particular place was there mentioned, naming *Jerusalem chamber*." Beveridge then rose and said, "Mr. Prolocutor, I advise you, in the name of Jesus Christ, not to open our first meeting in such contempt and disobedience to the archbishop and bishops, and in giving such offence and scandal to our enemies." The prolocutor replied, that he had power to alter the schedule when he intimated it.

From the MS. now quoted, we are informed, that the prolocutor and clergy met on the 20th of January in the nave of the abbey; after which they proceeded to the Jerusalem chamber, and joined in the prayers with the archbishop and bishops. The president told the prolocutor that Henry VII.'s chapel was ready for the clergy, and that they might expect an address from the upper house. It is stated, that they found the chapel convenient, "by matting the floor." Some members proposed prayers a second time, as a house, but the motion was opposed by others; "but being unwilling to begin with a dispute of that nature, we consented to prayers read by the prolocutor." Long debates, says the writer of the MS., followed about proposing committees for purposes "presented in the last convocation." The *Narrative* was mentioned; and Dr. Finch said, that it had passed through the hands of the prolocutor, "bowing to the Dean of Canterbury." The writer of the MS. remarked that this manner might lead to a suspicion that the dean was the author of the Narrative, who expressed his concern at Finch's statement. Finch, in explanation, replied, that his words merely meant that it had been read in the prolocutor's presence. The Dean of Canterbury was annoyed; and the writer says, "I begged leave to speak again, that the first expression of Dr. Finch might have laid the foundation of a misunderstanding, or

somewhat worse, if I had not given him an occasion to explain himself, by which he had satisfied the house."

During these debates, the address to the king from the bishops had remained in the hands of the prolocutor. After some discussions, it was agreed to.[a]

Woodward was now Dean of Sarum, owing all his preferments to Burnet; but he had become popular from his opposition to his friend and patron. On the 22d of January the two houses presented their address to the king: in this they were unanimous; but on the 28th, another cause of difference arose between the bishops and the clergy.[b] A member proposed that the form of prorogation in the minutes should be changed: that the words, *Dominus Prolocutor continuavit et prorogavit quoad hanc domum*, should be substituted for the usual form, *Prolocutor intimavit hanc convocationem esse continuatam*.[c] The entry was made; but at the next session exceptions were taken against it by several members. The majority, however, declared in favour of the alteration, and that the question should not be debated. When, therefore, the archbishop's schedule was sent down, it was laid aside upon the table; upon which a member stated, that some message had been sent from above, and that it should be communicated to the house before any other business was proceeded with. The majority resisted the motion, and proceeded to appoint a

[a] Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 4, 5, 8-12. These Mss. are very valuable.

[b] Tenison's Life, 92. "We had a melancholy prospect last night. The old prolocutor refused to stand. Dr. Jane was not come up, and we were forced to agree upon the Dean of Sarum." Atterbury, iii. 59. In another letter he says: "Our majority is much sunk to what it was." Ib. 62.

[c] This member was Atterbury. It had been held that the archbishop had the right of continuing the whole convocation. Discussions of a friendly character had on other occasions occurred; but to-day Atterbury succeeded in getting the change made in the entry. Present State of the Convocation, p. 5. He was afterwards supported by the majority. Ib. 6. Kennet says, that the members of the committee who had receded from no principle, "found themselves insulted by some and suspected by others." Comp. Hist. iii. 852. Present State of Convocation, &c. 1702, 4to, pp. 4-6.

committee of grievances, after which the prolocutor adjourned the house by their own authority. Certain members protested against this unprecedented course, alleging that the archbishop's schedule was the instrument by which the whole convocation was prorogued. Their protest was afterwards committed to writing; and on the 9th of February the Dean of Peterborough moved, that it should be entered on the minutes.[d] The motion was resisted; but at last a resolution was adopted to this effect, that a committee should be appointed to consider of such an expedient respecting the prorogation as might tend to the termination of their disputes. This committee was composed of sixteen persons, eight on each side in the controversy. At their meeting on the following day, they concurred in the following heads of agreement:

"1. That in order to an accommodation, no forms of prorogation shall be used by the prolocutor hereafter, that were not used by the prolocutor before the last convocation.

"2. That the forms of prorogation used by the prolocutor in the convocation of 1586 and 1588 shall hereafter be used by the prolocutor, in the order they lie in the books, beginning with the first, till they are all gone through.

"3. That these forms shall be pronounced by the prolocutor, when the house agrees that their business is over."[e]

[d] Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 13.

[e] Gibson Mss. vol. vi. no. 14, 16; Comp. Hist. iii. 850, 852; Tenison's Life, 93, 94; Present State of Convocation, 9, 10, 16. The author of the Present State gives Beveridge's speech before the committee was formed. It was his opinion, as stated on this occasion, "that convocations had a right to meet with parliaments, and might treat and come to many preparatory resolutions without a royal license." These points, he said, had not been disputed. But he declared for the archbishop's power of proroguing by a schedule to be intimated by the prolocutor, though the business of the day need not terminate. They might sit "the whole synodical day," if business required it, but the schedule must then be executed. Ib. 9. Atterbury says, that knowing that the right of sitting during the intervals of prorogations

But these resolutions became the cause of a new controversy among the members of the lower house, some of whom boasted of victory, and that the archbishop's schedule was excluded in the matter of the prorogation. Other members resolved on signing a declaratory form, to be presented to the house, in which they agreed that the words, "these forms shall be pronounced by the prolocutor," were understood by them, with an exception to any case when the president might send an order with the schedule, signifying the express time of intimating the prorogation on that day; and they add, "otherwise, if it were pretended to mean, that the authority of the archbishop, or any order sent from the upper house, was thereby excluded or diminished, they then solemnly protest against any such meaning or pretended meaning." This document was subscribed by several members. The eight members of the

would lead to disputes, they contented themselves with meeting at the same time with the bishops; and after some time appointed a committee to devise the means of an accommodation. He observes, that the committee succeeded in their object, when it was defeated by a new dispute, arising out of the death of Woodward, the prolocutor. According to Atterbury, the blame does not attach to the lower clergy, who used all the means they could adopt short of giving up their rights. He contended for the right to appoint their own sessions, since otherwise "it will be impossible to secure any of their other legal rights and privileges at such junctures, when the administration of ecclesiastical affairs shall fall into hands that may allow themselves to be made instruments of suppressing synods, and of serving the ill design of those who are the restless enemies of this established Church and constitution." Atterbury's Correspondence, ii. 214, 217. This was delivered in a charge, as Archdeacon of Totnes, in 1702. It is singular that in another charge, as should complain of the ignorance of the forms of convocation, arising from the infrequency of synods in the previous reign. The forms, he says, were "little understood, and could not easily be retrieved from the poor remains of the journals of either house which were left unconsumed by the great fire." He asserts that this ignorance occasioned the unjust claims of the upper house. Ib. 211, 212. After all Atterbury's activity, it would seem that even his friends were afraid of him. Writing to Trelawney in Feb. 1700-1701, he says: "The whole lower house seem to be afraid to do what your lordship was not afraid to do singly,—to own me; and I have some reason to apprehend that it is already determined to drop me: by whose direction a little time will shew." Ib. ii. 29.

committee who took a similar view, met and signed a declaration, in which they stated that they had united with the other eight with a sincere desire for peace, and that under the influence of that desire, they had "endeavoured to find an expedient for the present practice, that should not determine the merits of the question between 'em." They also stated, that to accomplish the end, they had adopted the ancient methods, when the controversy had not been moved; and that as they could not agree upon a form which was agreeable to both parties, and since the books of 1586 and 1588 were considered as most authentic by both sides, they had resolved that the forms should be taken in order from these books. Further they declared, that though they admitted the power of the archbishop to prorogue the house, yet that, believing that his grace did not expect the immediate intimation of his continuation, unless he had also sent a special order to that effect, they had concurred in the third proposition or head of agreement.[f]

On the 12th of February the prolocutor, being unable to attend to the duties of his office in consequence of severe indisposition, deputed Aldrich to act as his substitute. The house concurred in opinion that a deputy must be appointed; but there was a difference among them respecting the right to appoint. However, as no application was made to the archbishop to confirm the appointment, he summoned the members to appear in the Jerusalem Chamber. He told them, in allusion to the appointment of a deputy, that *an incident of great moment had happened*, and that, as time was necessary to consider it, he should adjourn them until Saturday.[g]

[f] Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 15, 17. The declaration was signed by Sherlock and others. They declare that the meaning was to be understood with an exception "to any case when the president, with consent of his brethren, shall see cause to send an order with the schedule signifying the express time of intimating the prorogation upon that day." They protest against it if intended to diminish the authority of the archbishop and bishops. Ib.

[g] It was proposed on one side to accept the deputy, after the archbishop's

Dr. Woodward, the prolocutor, had been engaged in a dispute with his diocesan, Bishop Burnet. On the 9th of February, a complaint was made by the clergy to the upper house, that their prolocutor had been proceeded against in a suit for pretended contempt and disobedience; and further, that he had been admonished to appear on certain days within the period of the sitting of convocation, which was a breach of privilege. The bishops replied, that the proceedings had been commenced at a period when no privilege could be pleaded, and that at the commence-

sanction; and, while some members were going to inform his grace, they were stopped in the cloisters by another member, who suggested that they should wait until after prayers; upon which they returned, and the prolocutor's nomination was read. Aldrich, it is said, was induced by Atterbury to occupy the chair as deputy, though others objected to such a course. During the dispute two members took the instrument of nomination to the bishops, in the hope of getting it confirmed. They went as private members, not asking permission, since in their opinion there was no house. A tumultuous scene ensued in Henry VIIth's chapel, and during its continuance the members were summoned to attend the bishops in the Jerusalem Chamber. Present State, 19, 23, 26. The writer of the Ms. at Lambeth says: "Between nine and ten, while we were walking in the abbey, news came that the prolocutor was indisposed, and must send a deputy to act for him." The writer then says that Kennet spoke to Dr. Birch, that to prevent any difference they would accept a deputy, provided an application were made to the archbishop. To this proposal Birch and others appeared to assent, and to encourage Kennet to inform the archbishop that an application would be made. On their way, says the writer, they were met by a member in the cloisters, who said that they need not go until after prayers; upon which Kennet and the others returned. The actuary then gave an account of the appointment of Aldrich by the prolocutor, Kennet remarking that no one would object to the individual, but that an application must be made to the archbishop. Aldrich then read prayers, after which Kennet moved that a message should be conveyed to the president from the house. Aldrich replied, "Let the sub-prolocutor take the chair;" and he was placed therein. "This raised a tumultuous noise that he had no right to the chair till confirmed." Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 18. While the members were leaving the Jerusalem Chamber, Atterbury, it was said, pushed some of them, crying, "Away to the lower house." Present State, &c. 27. They actually assembled to the number of forty-two. Ib. 30. The archbishop had prorogued them for two days, in the hope of the prolocutor's recovery, that so the dispute might terminate. He did not send the schedule, but summoned them to the upper house. Ib. 30.

ment of the convocation the Bishop of Sarum had ordered a *stet* to be put upon the cause. They added, that they could see no ground for the complaint.[h]

It should be mentioned that Woodward acted with impartiality in the post to which he was advanced. It is stated that "he conducted himself with candour and abilities much beyond what was expected from him."[i]

On Friday, February 13, the prolocutor died; and on the following day the archbishop, after alluding to the circumstance, and stating that the Dean and Chapter of Westminster would use that room on the Monday and Tuesday, Wednesday also being Ash-Wednesday, prorogued the convocation until Thursday.[j]

On the 29th of February, the archbishop dismissed the clergy in a speech of considerable length and great moderation, in which he touched upon the various topics which had been made the subjects of discussion. He alluded to the death of the prolocutor, and the choice of a successor, telling the house that he should take time to consider the subject, and at present proceed to a prorogation. He added, however, that he should continue the prorogation, from time to time, during the session of parliament, so that, on any emergency, the convocation might be assembled. He assured the clergy, that those who considered that he and the bishops wished to bring convocations into disuse, were greatly mistaken. In allusion to their controversies he remarked, "Such heats have given great scandal and offence, even to those who understand not the nature of the controversy, but are much concerned

[h] Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 25, 26. This volume contains the letters of Loggan to the bishop on the subject. At Burnet's triennial visitation, the Dean of Sarum, as rector of Pewsy, declined to attend; upon which the bishop issued a citation before the meeting of convocation, but afterwards ordered the *stet*. Tenison's Life, 96. In the answer of the bishops to the address of the clergy this is stated. Present State, 39, 40; Comp. Hist. iii. 853.

[i] Prideaux's Life, 102; Tenison's Life, 95, 96.

[j] Comp. Hist. iii. 852; Calamy, 614, 615.

that there should be any differences among men, who are, by profession, the *ministers of the gospel of peace*."[k]

Many of the clergy were satisfied with the archbishop's address; but others took a contrary view, and, meeting together two days after in Henry VIIth's chapel, chose a chairman or moderator to preside over their discussions. On the day appointed by the archbishop for assembling, this section of the clergy came to the room adjoining the Jerusalem Chamber, as a house of convocation, where they met the Bishop of Lincoln, the archbishop's commissary, who had further prorogued the assembly. They requested the bishop to convey a message to his grace, expressive of their desire to proceed to the choice of a prolocutor. The bishop declined to be the bearer of a verbal message, lest there should be some mistake in its delivery; but he expressed his readiness to take a written statement. When they had begun to dictate a request, a member, who had waited on the bishop, rose, and expressed his hope that the paper would not go forth in the name of the whole house, inasmuch as the present assembly did not constitute the house, neither could act as such without a prolocutor. He proposed, therefore, that it should run in the names of several members of the lower house. The bishop, in writing down their request, called it the request of certain members of the lower house; but the proposal was vehemently opposed by the majority, who reflected severely on the individual from whom it emanated.[l]

[k] Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 19; Comp. Hist. iii. 854; Present State, 35-37; Atterbury, iii. 77-81, 86; Tenison's Life, 97-99.

[l] Comp. Hist. iii. 855; Tindal's Cont. ii. 530, 531; Tenison's Life, 100. It appears that even on the 29th of February some of the members met in a separate place and had prayers; others met with the bishops, "as the only place of synod." Afterwards the former party came to the Jerusalem Chamber, and heard the archbishop's speech. Present State, 34. It is remarked by Tenison that no synodical business was yet before the convocation by royal authority, as it must have been suspended during their disputes. He hoped for something during the recess, as materials were prepared for "a draught for composing a modus tenendi convocationem. I have communi-

The death of the king occurred shortly after, when another question was raised, whether the convocation expired with the sovereign? Some of the clergy contended, that as the parliament was to continue for a time, so the sessions of the convocation might be continued, if not as a synod, yet as a part of the parliament according to the præmunientes clause. The lawyers, however, decided against them, upon which they requested the lords to pass an act for their continuance. At last, the attorney-general having stated that such a course would be against the royal supremacy, the question was dropped, and the convocation was ended. "And happy had it been if all other disputes of this nature could have dropped with it."[m]

It is painful to contemplate the proceedings of the convocation at this period; nor is it easy to decide on whom

cated one authentic book, which came lately to my hands, and am in hopes of recovering another." This was probably the book published by Gibson in the Synodus Anglicana. Tenison intimated his intention to prorogue, but at such intervals as to allow of their meeting on an emergency. He alluded to a faithful Account of some Transactions in the three last sessions of this present Convocation, intimating that it was not consistent with the title. A reply to this paper was published, The present State of Convocation, from January 28 to February 19, correcting the mistakes of The Pretended faithful Account, 4to, 1702. This writer condemns the author of the Account for publishing what occurred in convocation. He points to Atterbury as the author. Certain passages, he says, "betray the spirit of one single writer, who began the controversy in such sort of language, and I doubt not has attained the habit of it." "These censures could have hardly fell from above one person in the world." pp. 2, 3.

[m] Comp. Hist. iii. 855; Tindal's Cont. iii. 532; Tenison's Life, 101. Great efforts were made at the commencement of Queen Anne's reign to persuade the people of the moderation of the Pretender. Leslie tells Burnet that the Pretender gave up the regale in March 1702, allowing bishops to be appointed by the archbishop and four bishops. Leslie's Letter to Burnet, p. 12. He asks Burnet whether he believed the Pretender to be the queen's son when he prayed for him at the Hague; or if the Prince of Orange believed it when he sent to congratulate James? Ib. It is frequently stated in the publications of the time that Burnet officiated at the Hague when the young prince was prayed for, and that he discontinued it at Exeter. The good Old Cause, pp. 33, 34; Act Books, Mss. 1700-1702, Lower House.

the blame must be fixed. It must be admitted that the bishops acted with great moderation and forbearance, while not a few of the clergy pursued an opposite course. No consistent member of the Anglican Church could, I conceive, defend the lower house in all their proceedings; but it would be unjust to condemn them altogether, or to cast all the blame upon the members of that body. Had the clergy, however, proceeded with temper, arrangements might probably have been made between them and the bishops, without the occurrence of any thing unpleasant or improper. The animosities which were then engendered were more injurious to the Church than the schism of the nonjurors, inasmuch as internal divisions are always more fatal in their effects than external attacks.

The following extracts shew, in a very admirable manner, the true state of the case between the two houses. "And now a debate arose concerning the privileges of the lower house, where a majority of the members claimed to be on the same footing as to the upper house that the Commons in parliament are in regard to the House of Lords; that is, to adjourn by their own authority, apart from the upper house, where, and to such time, as they should think fit. This the upper house, that is, the bishops, would not admit of, but insisted that the ancient usage, which had been all along continued, was, that the president adjourned both houses together, and to the same time; and that this was signified by schedule sent down to the lower house; and that this practice they would abide by, and allow of no other; and so far Dr. Prideaux concurred with them, as thinking them in the right. But as to their requiring that the lower house should break up as soon as the schedule came down to them, and appoint no committees to sit and act on the intermediate days, he was clearly of opinion that in both these particulars they were wholly in the wrong; for as the bishops usually break very early, to attend the service of the House of Lords in parliament, and then sent down the schedule of adjournment

to the lower house, if on the receipt of this schedule, the lower house must immediately break up also, what time could they have to despatch the business before them ?"[n]

Two months were occupied in discussions between the two houses on this subject; and before the committee appointed to consider it had come to any conclusion the prolocutor died, when a new topic of controversy arose respecting the appointment of a successor. This was concluded by the death of King William, on the 8th of March, 1701-2.

While these disputes were going on betwixt the two houses, the controversy raged as strongly as ever through the press. The author of the *Reconciling Letter* charged Atterbury with contradicting himself in the two editions of his book.[p] It has been stated already that Atterbury had corrected, in a *second* edition, many of the mistakes of the *first*. The various mistakes and corrections are pointed out in the letter. It should be mentioned that the lower house of convocation passed a vote of thanks to Atterbury for his work, which was communicated by the prolocutor in an address; and a letter was written to Oxford by the house, in which his merits in writing the book were asserted; and it was added, "It might be hoped the University would not be less forward in taking some public notice of so great a piece of service to the Church." It was intimated that the *most proper and seasonable mark of*

[n] Prideaux's Life, 103, 104. One party claimed intermediate sessions as a right. The schedule fixed the day of meeting; but as private individuals they can meet on intermediate days to prepare business for submitting to the synod. On the other hand, the right of prorogation to their own time was claimed by Atterbury's party. It was argued very forcibly that such a claim would involve the exercise of authority by presbyters over presbyters, and the invasion of episcopal rights. No such claim was pleaded in 1689. Schedule reviewed, 11-15, 23, 27, 55.

[o] Prideaux's Life, 104.

[p] The Narrative of the Lower House vindicated. A Reconciling Letter upon the late Differences about Convocational Rights, &c.

respect would be to confer upon him the degree of D.D. by diploma. This was accordingly done by the University.[q]

One of the most important works of this year was the *Synodus Anglicana*, which was written by Gibson, though his name does not appear on the title-page. In this work the constitution and proceedings of convocation are illustrated from the acts and registers. It contains the registers of the upper house in 1562, 1640, and 1661; and the journals of the lower house of 1586 and 1588. All the points, especially those respecting the schedule, which had been so keenly discussed, are treated with great moderation in this valuable work, to which I refer the reader for full information on the subjects at issue between the two houses.

It has been mentioned that the lower house did not succeed in procuring the authoritative condemnation of Burnet's *Exposition of the Articles*. The attack in convocation, however, led the way to another from the press. Several works were published in which his positions were assailed with great severity.[r] The author of the *Prefatory*

[q] Biog. Brit. art Atterbury; Tindal's Cont. iii. 529; Calamy, i. 610, 611. Various works appeared in the controversy at this time. Reflections upon a late paper entitled an Expedient Proposed, &c., 4to. 1702. This was by Gibson. The Present State of Convocation, in a Letter, giving the full relation of Proceedings in several of the late Sessions, and the Case of the Schedule stated. This latter work, by Atterbury, was answered by Gibson in the Schedule reviewed. Atterbury wrote the Parliamentary Original and Rights of the Lower House of Convocation cleared, and the Evidences of its separation from the Upper House produced on several heads. In this work Atterbury says that he had prepared the way by precedents for a separate application of the lower house to the queen or parliament to settle their differences. He expresses an opinion that the bishops would not yield. Atterbury's Cor. iii. 75, 76.

[r] A Prefatory Discourse to an Examination of a late Book, intituled An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; with a Examination of some Passages in the Preface to the Exposition, by way of Appendix to the foregoing Discourse. By a Presbyter of the Church of England, 4to, 1702. The Exposition given by my Lord Bishop of Sarum, of the Second Article of our Religion, examined, 4to, 1702 A Vindication of the Twenty-third Article from the Bishop's Exposition of it. Burnet replied in

Discourse states the complaints made by the lower house of convocation, specifying the heads and enlarging upon each of them as he proceeds. He argues that the articles were not framed for the satisfaction of other reformed Churches abroad, but for the sake of peace at home.

From the disputes in convocation at this period the appellations *High Church* and *Low Church* originated, and they were afterwards used to distinguish the clergy. It is singular that the bishops were ranked among the Low Churchmen.[s]

Queen Anne's first parliament met in October 1702; and, according to the usual practice, the convocation assembled at the same time. Dr. Aldrich, dean of Christ Church, was chosen prolocutor of the lower house.[t] A contest arose between the two houses respecting the usual address to the throne; for the lower house was disposed to cast reflections on the late reign, which they embodied in the form of an address. Such a course was resisted by the bishops, and at last an address to her majesty was agreed upon by both houses, in which they expressed their sense

Remarks on the Examination of the Exposition of the Second Article; and a friend published an Answer to the Prefatory Discourses, and a Defence of his Exposition of the Twenty-third Article. The Prefatory Discourse was written by Binkes. Atterbury, iii. 71. Biog. Brit. art. Burnet. The Vindication was by Burscough, though it has been ascribed to Trelawney, in consequence of the following passage in a letter to Sprat: "I had a particular obligation to Burnet, and will publicly thank him in print (among other matters I have to say to him and to his Articles against our religion), for his causing it to be spread by his emissaries that I was drunk at Salisbury the 30th of January." The bishop declares he only drank two dishes of coffee. Atterbury, iii. 89; Nicolson, i. 179. The Exposition, &c. was written by Jonathan Edwards; and Elys published Reflections on a late Exposition, &c. 4to. Biog. Brit.

[s] Burnet, ii. 347; Calamy, i. 643; Tindal's Cont. iv. 591. In 1702 Nicolson published a Letter in Defence of the English Historical Library, in which he calls Atterbury an *ambitious wretch*. Nicolson, i. 228-262.

[t] "He had always been a constant voter for encroachments upon the power of the president and the upper house, insomuch that instead of healing up former breaches, the old sores broke out with greater rancour than ever." Tenison's Life, 102.

of the divine favour in placing her majesty on the throne of these realms. The contest, however, had lasted some days before the address could be agreed upon; thus it was evident that the same spirit existed in this convocation that had been manifested so strongly in the last. In the form proposed by the clergy the bishops were clearly alluded to. It was withdrawn when the upper house refused to concur. It is indeed probable that the lower house did not expect, or even wish to present it to her majesty, but merely to annoy the bishops. The queen told the convocation, in reply to the address, that "their concurrence in this dutiful address was a good presage of their union in all other matters, which was very desirable for her service and the good of the Church."[u]

This harmony was soon interrupted, however, by the revival of the former disputes. The lower house requested the bishops to take into consideration the matters in dispute in the two preceding convocations, in order that, after a settlement of these various points, the business of the synod might be conducted for the welfare of the Church. The upper house replied on the 13th of November, that they were anxious to terminate all differences; that though the right of prorogation was with them, they would use it in such a manner as should conduce to peace and unity. They also stated, that with a view to the attainment of this desirable object a committee of bishops was appointed to meet deputies from the lower house, in order that the matters in dispute might be amicably arranged.[v] It was proposed by the upper house, that during the intervals of

[u] Tindal's Cont. iii. 589, 590; Burnet, ii. 345.

[v] In a visitation charge in 1703, Atterbury says, that the bishops had agreed in the new convocation, "that the lower house might meet in committees between the synodical prorogations," and that the archbishop would so order matters as to give time for the consideration of subjects which came before them. He adds, that this scheme left all in doubt, and therefore they asked for a final settlement of the dispute, which was refused: and that there was no alternative but to sit still or to apply to the queen. Before the latter could be acted on, the session was too far advanced. Atterbury, ii 224-226.

sessions the lower house might appoint committees to prepare matters for deliberation; and it was stated that the archbishop would so order prorogations that time should be given for the transaction of business. Many of the members were satisfied with this expedient, but the majority insisted on their right to hold meetings, and to act as a convocation during the intervals of prorogation; consequently they requested that some other proposal might be made by the bishops. They would not admit that their claims and those of the upper house in any way clashed. The upper house replied, that they had, in their judgment, offered what was sufficient, and that they could not depart from the archbishop's right. Upon this, the lower house proposed that both houses should concur in an application to her majesty, praying her to appoint persons to hear and adjudicate upon the controversy between the bishops and the clergy; but the archbishop and bishops replied, that they could not make any further concession without injury to their constitution as an episcopal Church; adding, that it would be a strange sight, and acceptable to their enemies, especially to the papists, to see the convocation pleading their rights before a committee of privy council.[w]

While these discussions were in progress, the lower house complained that, to their great surprise, they had been aspersed as enemies to the archbishop, and as ill affected to the episcopal rights; that, therefore, they had signed a declaration, which they were anxious to have entered on the books. In consequence of their disputes with the bishops, they had been represented as favourers of Presbytery, so that such a declaration was, in their estimation, necessary. It is obvious that the circumstance of the controversy was taken advantage of by party writers for party purposes; for no one, who knows the character of the men of whom the majority of the lower house was

[w] Life of Queen Anne, i. 168-174; Calamy, i. 635-637; Tenison's Life, 192; Tindal's Cont. 590, 591; Burnet, ii. 346.

composed, can allow that there was any foundation for the charge. It was merely a party trick. They considered that their rights were somehow in jeopardy, and this consideration led them to adopt measures which no one in the present day can justify; but still, to represent them as hostile to episcopacy, and as anxious for a presbyterian parity, argued, in the persons who originated the charge, either great ignorance or great dishonesty. I feel that thus much is due to the memory of the men, though I do not mean to imply that I view their proceedings in meeting the charge as unobjectionable. It might have been more dignified not to have noticed it in any way; nor can I avoid coming to the conclusion that the lower house took an unfair advantage of the circumstance; for they endeavoured to entrap the bishops into a decision of a question which it was not competent for them to decide, since to have done so would have been an infringement of the Act of Submission, inasmuch as such a declaration would, when agreed to by both houses, have amounted to a canon or constitution, while they had no royal license to proceed in any such business.

The declaration was as follows:—"Whereas they had been scandalously and maliciously represented as favourers of presbytery, in opposition to episcopacy, they now declared, that they acknowledged the order of bishops as superior to presbyters, to be of divine apostolical institution, and that they claimed no rights but what they conceived necessary to the very being of the lower house of convocation." It was signed by those who kept the intermediate sessions.

In another address on the same day, they desired the bishops to concur with them in settling the doctrine of episcopacy, that it might be the standing rule of the Church.[x] A question, it will be seen, was involved in the

[x] Tindal's Cont. iii. 591; Calamy, i. 638; Somerville, 56; Burnet, ii. 346, 347. Burnet says that the concurrence in the proposition would have been "an attempt to make a canon or constitution without a royal license."

declaration, which had been the subject of violent discussions ever since the Reformation, namely, the divine right of episcopacy. Probably, in the present day, consistent Churchmen will not be able to discover any great difference between the views of the declaration and those of the Church, as expressed in the commencement of the preface to the Ordination-service, in which it is asserted that bishops, priests, and deacons have always existed in the Church. Still, it was contended by many, that though the Church admitted that there had always been three orders in the ministry, she had not decided the point whether bishops were superior to presbyters by divine appointment, or only by the ordinances and practice of the Church. It would seem, to plain and unprejudiced persons, that the sentence from the Ordination-service is decisive of the question; for it positively asserts the existence of three orders of ministers, and asserts it on the authority of Scripture, as well as on that of the practice of the primitive Church. If bishops have existed from the Apostles' times, they must surely have existed as an order distinct from and superior to presbyters; and such I think must have been the views of the framers of the preface to the Ordination-service, or they would not have joined Scripture and antiquity together as the foundation on which to rest their assertion of three orders in the Church.

At the same time it must be admitted that it was the intention of the lower house to involve the bishops in a difficulty. The difficulty was this: supposing the bishops to concur, the point was gained; but if they refused, the bishops themselves might appear to be secret favourers of presbytery. Some members of the lower house presented an address to the archbishop, in which they disclaimed the declaration, on the ground that such a proceeding was dangerous, though they fully concurred in the doctrines which it asserted. They stated that they doubted whether, as the Church had not declared that bishops were superior to presbyters by divine institution, they could legally as-

sert it in convocation without the royal license. They requested, therefore, that their protest might be entered on the books.

On the 15th of December the archbishop told the prolocutor that an answer could not, as the question was one of great importance, be returned until after Christmas. The lower house stated that they were now traduced for allowing too much to episcopacy, though not long since they had been charged with attempts to diminish it; on which account they wished the bishops to consider the subject, and to support the doctrine, by a declaration against all Erastian or Arian theories.[y]

While the bishops were engaged in the consideration of the subject, the lower house drew up and presented a petition to her majesty, stating that, after the interruption of convocations for a space of ten years, several questions had arisen in the year 1700 respecting the rights and liberties of the lower house; that they had offered to submit the whole matter to her majesty's determination, but that the proposal had been declined by the bishops. They therefore prayed that her majesty would call the question into her own presence. The queen promised to take the matter into consideration, and to return them an answer as soon as possible.

When the council came to consider the subject, they found that it had been the constant practice for the archbishop to prorogue by schedule, and that the form could not be altered except by act of parliament. One clause in the schedule continued all things in the same state until the next day of meeting; consequently there could be no

[y] Atterbury, in his charge at Totness in 1703, throws the blame of this matter upon the bishops, who, he says, aspersed the clergy as enemies to episcopacy. "So far was this absurd slander carried, that the lower house were reduced to a necessity of justifying themselves by declaring their opinion of the divine right of episcopacy, and beseeching their lordships' concurrence in that declaration, which, nevertheless, they could not obtain." Atterbury's Correspondence, ii. 29, 30.

intermediate sessions. No answer was given by the crown; and as the leading members of the administration at that time favoured the views of the majority in the lower house, it was supposed that the answer was withheld, because it must have been unfavourable to the pretensions of the clergy, and in favour of the bishops. Others, though perhaps not very charitably, imagined that the ministers of the crown wished to keep the debate alive, and that on this ground they declined to return an answer.[z]

At length, on the 20th of January, the archbishop replied, that the preface to the Ordination-service contained a declaration of three orders in the ministry; but that he and the bishops conceived that they were not at liberty to enact any canon or rule respecting doctrine or discipline without the royal license. They commended the zeal of the lower house for episcopacy, and expressed a hope that they would continue to act in accordance with it in future.

The bishops saw the aim of the lower house by their declaration; and it must be admitted that this was a most clever way of extricating themselves from the difficulty. The clergy expressed their surprise that the bishops would not say whether they did or did not concur with them in the declaration. Parliament was now prorogued, and consequently the convocation broke up for the season.[a]

The convocation met with the parliament in the autumn of 1703.[b] On the 8th of December the lower house sent a

[z] Tindal's Cont. iii. 591; Burnet, ii. 347; Calamy's Abridgment, i. 638, 639. Burnet says that the judges were consulted by the crown, but that no answer was given by the ministry, because their decision was supposed to be adverse to the claims of the lower house; "and therefore the ministers chose rather to give no answer, and that it should seem to be forgotten, than such a one should be given as would put an end to the debate, which they intended to cherish and support."

[a] Act-Book of Lower House, Mss. 1702, 1703. This volume contains the original signatures of the lower house to the address on the subject of Presbytery.

[b] A few of the members met in November, but only one side appeared,

paper to the archbishop, complaining of the licentiousness of the press, and intimating also that other matters were before them respecting discipline, though they wished the question of the books to be first considered. In another paper they complained of the inefficiency of the laws respecting the collection of church-rates, and prayed that a bill might be prepared to be presented to parliament on the subject.[c] In the spring the lower house presented a long paper, which had been prepared by a committee during the recess, between the 15th of December and the 4th of February. Various matters were introduced into this document, in the form, as it was expressed by the house, of heads of matters approved by them, and to be submitted to the consideration of the bishops. Among other topics of complaint, one refers to the canons, and especially to the fourteenth canon, which enjoins that the Common Prayer should be read entire, without omissions or changes. They also complain of the neglect on the part of parents and others in bringing infants to church that had been privately baptised; also of certain alleged irregularities with respect to marriages, with other matters connected with the services and discipline of the Church. One special topic related to baptism by dissenting ministers. They offered to make good all their allegations, if the upper house would permit.[d]

knowing that there would be a prorogation. Atterbury states that he had a difficulty in getting assessors named: "I take it for granted, therefore, that it is resolved by our leader that we shall do nothing." Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 131, 135, 141.

[c] The archbishop said that such a bill was ordered; and he wished members to go to Lambeth to examine it. "We shall carry up to-morrow an address to the bishops that we may join with them in framing the fast-prayers, according to a precedent in the journal of their house after the Restoration." Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 147, 148, 151.

[d] Tindal's Cont. iii. 645; Calamy, i. 655, 656; Somerville, 88, 89. Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 707-718. Burnet says they "took care to mention none of those greater ones of which many among themselves are eminently guilty, such as pluralities, non-residence, the neglect of their cures, and the irregularities in the lives of the clergy, which were too visible." Burnet, ii. 380.

The archbishop informed the clergy that copies of their representation should be given to the bishops, who would make a proper use of it in their visitations. The archbishop afterwards told them, that some of their complaints did not come properly within the canons. He admitted, however, that great care and diligence were necessary.

Atterbury alludes to the discussion on this representation, intimating that Hooper influenced some members to propose a prorogation to Feb. 3, in order that the document might not be presented on the 4th. Writing on the 5th, he says: "We passed our grievances yesterday. Some faint opposition was made by the creatures of our late leader. The paper was presented on the 11th, when the address to the queen, drawn up by the bishops, was sent down to the lower house." Atterbury, iii. 164, 165, 175. Alluding to the committee by whom the representation had been drawn up during the recess, Atterbury says of Hooper: "It is not to be expressed what an uneasiness our quondam leader shews at these steps; for he is to the utmost averse to our entering on any thing that may do either us or the Church service, or indeed towards our doing any thing besides fighting his battles." Alluding to some reported attempt of Hooper's against him, he says: "God forgive him; it is a very ill return for my making that scuffle which set him at the head of the lower clergy, and consequently made him what he is now." Correspondence, iii. 156, 158. Some time after the appearance of Atterbury's book, he says in a letter to Trelawney, 1700, that Lord Chief Justice Holt had proposed to the judges a declaration on the Act of Submission in opposition to his work, as well as a censure of the work, as intrenching on the royal prerogative. He attributed the scheme to Tenison; yet it is doubtful whether such a notion was entertained. In the same letter he mentions his new edition, then inpreparation, intimating a wish to put his name to the book, though he was "kept back by this new scene that opens." In a subsequent letter he again alludes to the subject, saying that the notion proposed by Holt was not relinquished, and that the archbishop and Wake were at the bottom of this scheme. Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8. Yet, notwithstanding his book, his credit was not always good with his own party. Writing to Trelawney in 1703, he speaks of Hooper as his enemy. He seems to have dreaded Hooper's advancement to the bench: "If so, I am sure to be oppressed and kept under as much as if Archbishop Tillotson were alive." "Let the Dean of Canterbury be as great as he will, I must take the liberty to say, that it was my poor labours that made him so. For had not that book I wrote procured a convocation, and given him by that means an opportunity of forming a strong body of the clergy and placing himself at the head of them, he could not have made it necessary for the crown to take notice of him. In return for this, I know I am to be neglected as far as he is able to bring it about." Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 98.

At this time Queen Anne gave up the *first fruits* and *tenths*, which had long been possessed by the crown, to be appropriated to a fund for the increase of small livings. This fund is known as Queen Anne's bounty, from which many small benefices have been increased by an additional endowment. The convocation of Canterbury presented an address of thanks to her majesty on the occasion; and the example was followed in the province of York. "As a further demonstration of her most affectionate and tender care for the good of all that minister in holy things, she hath begun a new year of her life with declaring her generous intention to give all her revenue arising from the *first fruits* and *tenths* to increase the mean and insufficient maintenance of the clergy in divers parts of the kingdom; by which charitable and gracious act she will highly adorn the Reformation made by her ancestors, and surpass them all in her munificence and royal bounty to the Church of England."[e]

On the 10th of March the clergy sent up a paper to the bishops, in which they assert the right of being summoned with the parliament. They also complained that the royal writ and the archbishop's mandate had not been executed in the diocese of Bangor. On the 3d of April the convocation was prorogued with the parliament, so that no further steps were taken respecting the complaints of the lower house.[f] In his closing speech the archbishop

[e] A Form of Prayers used by his late Majesty King William III. when he received the holy sacrament, and on other occasions; with a preface by the Right Reverend John Lord Bishop of Norwich. London, 1704. Preface. Gibson's Codex, 917, 918; Grey, 316-318; Life of Queen Anne, i. 229. The lower house presented an address of thanks to the Commons for their proceedings in favour of the clergy. The Commons also thanked the clergy by a vote. The convocation of York also addressed the queen at the same time. Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 178, 180; Life of Queen Anne, i. 140; Kennet's Impropriations, 360-364.

[f] Tindal's Cont. iii. 646; Somerville, 89; Calamy, i. 657-663. The lower house continued to treat the schedule merely as an intimation that the bishops had adjourned; and then they prorogued themselves by their own authority,

alluded to their *representation;* and, after remarking that *visitations* were never more frequent nor more effective than they had been since the last open attempt to bring in popery, he admitted that it was desirable that all abuses should be rectified. The sessions ended with the archbishop's speech, April 3d, 1703-4.

The *State-services* must once more be mentioned. Besides the three offices, a special form was prepared for the day of the queen's accession. It was framed partly from King James's office, which was laid aside during the reign of King William, and is still retained. In an edition of the Prayer-book of 1703 the form is printed without the order; but in subsequent editions the order is found, bearing date the 7th day of February, 1703-4, "in the second year of our reign." On the accession of George I. and George II. the usual order was issued for the ob-

and held intermediate sessions. "And to shew how little it was in the heart of that member who set a-foot these innovations to recede, he drew up a declaration concerning the necessity of the parliament writ to the being of a convocation." Gibson's Marks of a Defenceless Cause, preface. Gibson complains of Atterbury's concealment of his Mss., adding that Tenison having discovered the acts of 1661, submitted them to convocation. It appears that Atterbury had the journal of the lower house in 1689. Ib. pp. 34, 35. He also possessed Heylin's collection of Mss. The circumstances are specially mentioned in the Observations of the Upper House, in a paper presented by the clergy Dec. 1st, 1704. In allusion to the desire of peace expressed by the lower house, the bishops remark, that the end would be promoted by the discovery of other records. "Upon this principle the most reverend the president, having been informed that the upper house register of 1661 was then in being, but in a private hand, he spared no pains to procure the original, that he might lay it (as he immediately did) before the two houses of convocation. It has been known to the lower house ever since the beginning of this controversie that Dr. Heylin's Extracts out of the lost records of Convocation are in the possession of one of their members. And yet notwithstanding these disputes, occasioned chiefly by the want of records, have been depending thus long, to the great disturbance of the convocation and the Church in general, he has not been prevailed with to produce them (tho' often upbraided publickly with the disingenuity of that concealment); nor have the lower house thought fit once to desire an examination of them in order to the public peace." The Complainer further reproved, &c. 1705, 4to, pp. 19, 20. This was written by Gibson.

servance of the three days, dated the first year of each reign; and also the separate order for the service for the accession. In the reign of George I. one change was made in the last service, namely, the substitution of the present first lesson from the book of Joshua for the chapter from Proverbs, which had been appointed by Queen Anne. On the accession of George III. one order only was used for the four services, and such has since been the practice. During the reign of Queen Anne the order for the three services was simply copied from the books of the preceding reign; the name of Queen Mary, as well as the date, being retained.

The Bishop of St. Asaph, in his sermon on Queen Anne's accession, 1703, gives an account of the proceedings relative to the observance of the day. "The custom of observing with solemnity the inauguration of our princes is of old, and was first discontinued by that wicked civil war, that confounded all observances both in Church and State, which made it dangerous to give God thanks (some years before he died) for placing King Charles I. upon the throne; by also setting up a lower house of tyrants, who did truly oppress the people more than any two kings had done since the Conquest, and were never outdone by any but themselves, when part of them became a court of justice and put their king to death. The inauguration-day was usually the day on which the predecessor died; but the 30th of January having been noted with such an execrable mark, could not have been observed with any decent joy." On this account the birth-day of Charles II. "was appointed for the festival." "The next reign set the inauguration right; but that, I think, was all. It was a day of great sorrow and little comfort; it gave us certain fears and very uncertain hopes; we had many things to ask of God on that day, but it could not be a day of much thanksgiving. But in a little time that day became more truly festival by being the birth-day of our present queen than for the honour it was marked with

by his succession to the throne." No inauguration-day was observed in King William's reign, "as well because there had been no decease, as for the great unsettlement and hurry all things and all people were then in."[g]

Johnson of Cranbrook, in the second edition of his *Vade Mecum*, alludes to certain doubts relative to the queen's authority to supersede the ordinary service. Yet he himself observed the occasional days until 1715, when he refused to use the form for the accession, contending that it was at a clergyman's discretion to use it or not. He was cited before his friend Green, archdeacon of Canterbury; but on the death of the archbishop, from tenderness to him, the proceedings were stopped. Six years later, in 1721, Johnson printed his *Opinion*, and the *Defence* which he intended to have made. A prosecution, therefore, was commenced by the new archdeacon against him for a libel on the supremacy. Consulting Dr. Henchman, he was informed that his conduct would probably be regarded as impugning the supremacy; and on appealing to the archbishop, the prosecution was stopped, on condition of a private submission, the delivery of all the unsold copies of his *Case of a Rector* to the metropolitan, and a promise to print no more.[h]

As Johnson's is the only case of the kind which ever came formally before a court, it possesses considerable in-

[g] Four Sermons, 82, 83.

[h] Lewis's Case of Fasts, &c., preface, i.-iv. Knaplock, the bookseller, told Lewis that he delivered all the unsold copies to the archbishop. So the matter ended. The 80th canon, in 1604, recognises the king's power in making alterations in the Book of Common Prayer. Johnson assigns himself a reason for such days. "Some have questioned by what law the fasts and thanksgivings appointed by the king are observed, and by what authority the office for the day appointed by act of parliament is set aside. I think it is sufficient in this case that the two houses of parliament have and do own this power to be lodged in the crown, as they do, by always submitting to these royal commands in observing these days." Vade Mecum, i. 198, 199. Johnson's letters to the archbishop were most submissive; they are still preserved among the Wake Mss. at Christ Church. Masters's History of Corpus Christi College, 322, 323.

terest. In the outset of his career, Johnson was a strong advocate for the revolution settlement; but by associating with Hickes, his views were greatly altered, and at last he impugned the royal supremacy by refusing to read the Accession-service in 1716. He had argued, in reply to the charge in the archdeacon's court, that he conformed to the Book of Common Prayer in every thing, and that he was not compelled to use the new form. He also refused to use all the occasional prayers which were put forth on fast and thanksgiving days, arguing in his defence that the king was supreme only through parliament, or convocation, or in his courts of law.[i]

The question arises, was Johnson's view correct according to the law, since it has never been formally decided? The case would probably have been decided against him; and were such a question ever to be brought into our courts, it would, I apprehend, be determined in favour of the right of the crown.[j] By the Act of Submission, and by the canons of 1604, the supremacy is asserted. A question would necessarily arise respecting the extent of that supremacy; but ecclesiastical power is undoubtedly lodged in the crown. The Church herself has spoken on this subject more pointedly than some persons are aware

[i] Johnson's Case of Occasional Days, &c., preface, and pp. 71-75.

A curious mistake has been made by some persons when the 30th of January has been a Sunday. The rubric has been mistaken. It stands thus at present: "If this day shall happen to be Sunday, this form of prayer shall be used, and the fast kept the following day." It is a fact that some clergymen have considered themselves bound to use the service on the Sunday. Had they, however, referred to the original service, they would have discovered that it was never intended that it should be used on the Sunday. The rubric originally stood thus: "If this day shall happen to be Sunday, this form of service shall be used the next day following." So in the act of parliament it is particularly appointed, that when the 30th of January happens to be Sunday, the next day is to be observed. The Church orders the next day, because a fast could not be kept on a festival: "for it is a rule always observed not to fast on Sunday, because that is the stated Christian feast in all Churches but those of Rome and Scotland." Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 198.

of. Thus, in the canons of 1640 it is declared that kings have always caused the day of their inauguration to be observed with prayers and thanksgivings; and a particular form was on this occasion authorised by convocation.[k] Johnson, finding these canons in his way, alleged that they had been repealed. As they made against his theory, he disposed of them in a summary way; and yet he well knew that they had never been recalled by the Church. Moreover, the rubric, by which the daily use of the Common Prayer is confirmed, supposes that the minister may be reasonably hindered. In short, it supposes that cases may arise when it is not used; and it may be presumed that the appointment of a fast or festival by the crown would be a lawful hindrance for that day. At all events, this doctrine has ever been held by our great divines since the Reformation. Archbishop Laud distinctly assigns such a power to the crown. "This Fast-Booke and all that have been made, have been both made and published by the command of the king, in whose sole power it is to call a fast. And the archbishops and bishops, to whom the ordering of the booke is committed, have power under the king to put in or leave out whatsoever they think fit for the present occasion, as their predecessors have ever done before them. Provided that nothing be in contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England." In this passage the whole question is involved; and if Laud's view is correct, there can be no doubt respecting the authority of the crown to appoint occasional services. On such occasions some few prayers are inserted, and some few are substituted for others for that particular day; in no other sense is the daily service superseded. The question is, whether the power is restrained by statute. The

[k] Laud's Speech in the Star Chamber, 1637, pp. 20, 21. Bishop Bilson says, that the sovereign may punish for the non-observance of such duties. Christian Subjection, 278. Johnson himself gives a sufficient argument for the observance of such days. As three of the days are appointed to be kept holy by act of parliament, it is almost certain that the supremacy would be

rubric after the Nicene Creed enjoins that nothing be published except what is prescribed by the crown, which implies a power in the crown to do something; and probably the appointment of such services would be regarded by our courts of law as comprehended in the royal supremacy.

In the year 1703 Wake published his important work against Atterbury.[1] It was once said, that though *truth* might

construed by our courts as extending to the appointment of special services for those occasions.

[1] State of the Church and Clergy in England, in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conventions, and other Public Assemblies, historically deduced from the Conversion of the Saxons to the Present Times; with an Appendix of original Writs and other Instruments; by William Wake, D.D., &c. &c.: occasioned by a book intituled the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, &c. Folio, 1703. The author of the Letter to a Convocation Man, which was the origin of the controversy at this period, regarded King William as an obstructor of synods. Wake contends ttha his majesty merely pursued the course of his predecessors, namely, assembled the convocation with the parliament, permitting it to transact business if it were wished. Atterbury held that the convocation had a right to meet with the parliament, which was denied by Wake, who argued that by the king's writ they were a convocation for state purposes, but not a synod for ecclesiastical business until duly licensed. Before the submission the archbishops could summon them at pleasure, as well as prorogue and dissolve. Formerly the power was divided between the prince and the primate, now it is only in the king. Atterbury argued for the right to treat, though they could not enact; Wake denied it altogether, asserting, however, that they could petition for a license, and present their grievances. Previous to the Reformation, the convocation of Canterbury usually met for mass in the chapel of the Virgin Mary at St. Paul's, and then retired to the chapter-house, where the certificates of the execution of the archbishop's mandate were exhibited. Originally bishops and clergy assembled together; and when difficulties arose, the archbishop commanded the clergy to go aside. In the year 1296 they deliberated in four bodies; namely, the bishops, deans and archdeacons, religious clergy, abbots and priors. Yet the clergy were only occasionally so sent apart. A prolocutor was not chosen till the time of Chicheley, about the middle of the fifteenth century; and not invariably until long after. Under his successor the custom of a separate house with a prolocutor was introduced, and has continued ever since. Wake's State, pref. p. 4, 10-15, 520. Nichols states that Wake's censures of some of the clergy occasioned "the dislike even of very many very moderate men." Defence, 128. And that Atterbury "very much blemished the beauties of his pen by too

be with Wake, the *appearance* of it was with Atterbury.[m] Atterbury's work was fair and specious; and in some points he was correct in his statements; but the position first taken by Wake, in his *Authority of Christian Princes*, respecting the powers of an English convocation since the Act of Submission, was so completely established in this learned and elaborate work, that no one has been able to shake it. Wake's volume may be appealed to as one of the most satisfactory on that portion of the convocation controversy. On other accounts the work is most useful. It contains a copious historical narration of synodical proceedings in England from the period of the conversion of the Saxons; and we may assert that the controversy, in-

great an acrimony, and too severe reflections upon his adversary." Ib. 129. Wake shews, I think, clearly, that the clergy have never attempted to treat of canons without a license. He admits that they can confer on canonical matters, provided that it be not with a view to enacting canons. They may discuss the question whether canons are required, and then petition for power. Ib. 583. In June 1700 Wake mentions in a letter that Gibson and Tanner were on pilgrimages for materials for his large work. He hopes to print by midsummer 1701. "This I am the rather desirous to do, because then I find it resolved, if all hold well, to have the convocation meet; and I desire before the House of Commons spiritual damns one book, they may have another to reflect upon." From this passage it would appear that he expected the condemnation of his Authority of Christian Princes. Nicolson's Correspondence, i. 203. In January 1700-1701 he mentions a rumour that he was to be condemned "in both Houses of Commons, spiritual and temporal." Ib. 217. His fears, however, were groundless; and his book was delayed. Hooper wrote a Summary Defence of the Lower House of Convocation concerning Adjournments, 1703, in reply to Gibson's Short State of some present Questions in Convocation. Gibson replied to Hooper in Marks of a Defenceless Cause in the proceedings and writings of the Lower House of Convocation, 1703. He also published the Pretended Independency of the Lower House, &c., being a Vindication of Synodus Anglicana. Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 99. The author of the New Danger of Presbytery contends that the claims of the lower house might be very dangerous, supposing fanaticism to prevail amongst them, when they might vote down bishops and the common prayer. He asks what the parliament of 1640 would have given for such a convocation. The New Danger of Presbytery; or, the Claims and Practices of some in the Lower House very dangerous to the Constitution of an Episcopal Church, &c. 1703, 4to, p. 15.

[m] Atterbury's Life, 8vo, 1727, p. 17.

asmuch as it originated this great work, was productive of good as well as of evil.

In the ensuing autumn, 1704, the convocation was assembled for the third time with the parliament. Binkes was chosen prolocutor. On the 1st of December the lower house presented another representation to the bishops, expressive of their sorrow that no benefit had accrued from the frequent meetings of convocation; and they intimate that the cause was to be found in the disputes between the two houses. No one could dispute such a position; but the difficulty consisted in this, that the one party imputed all the blame to the other; so that no fair prospect was presented of an amicable termination of their differences.[n] They also stated, that as no directions had been given them, they had on previous occasions made applications to the bishops on various subjects, instancing Toland's book. They therefore begged the upper house to interfere.

In their observations on this document the bishops go over the details of the proceedings of several years, enumerating the various acts of the lower house, going as far back even as 1689. "If it be a reproach to convocation to do no business while they have no license to empower them, it cannot be a less reproach to supersede all business with a royal license in their hands. Yet this was the case in 1689, when it was the general and avowed sense of the majority of the lower house that they could not better serve the Church than by declining the business proposed by the king."[o] Here certainly the bishops sacrificed their dignity in their desire to punish the clergy. Not a few of the men who were anxious to confirm all the pro-

[n] The clergy say: "We should think ourselves justly chargeable with all the evil consequences of those disputes, if our consciences did not bear us testimony that we neither raised them, nor after their rise omitted any means which we could possibly contrive for bringing them to a regular determination." The Complainer further reproved, &c. p. 2. They must certainly have been very much blinded by their prejudices to make such an assertion.

[o] The Complainer further reproved, &c. p. 12.

ceedings of the commissioners in 1689 lived long enough to see their error. Consequently the clergy acted wisely on that occasion. The circumstance shews that in this controversy there were faults on both sides. The bishops then specify all the irregular acts of the lower house during several years.[p] In allusion to Toland's book, they mention the difficulty of the case, and also that they had recommended the prosecution of the author by the bishop of the diocese.[q]

During the convocation a complaint was made against Burnet respecting a visitation charge which he had delivered to his clergy, and in which he had reflected on the lower house, in consequence of their representation of grievances, as enemies to the bishops, the Church, and the country. The clergy called upon the house to interpose its authority.[r] They also stated that they had received no reply to their paper of the 1st of December.

Their paper had been answered in the preceding "Observations," yet the lower house chose not to notice them, since they had not been communicated in due form, but only entered in the books of the upper house. In allusion to their paper of the 1st of December, it was stated by the bishops that no license had been granted for business; that there were laws and canons in existence sufficient to punish offenders; that the present disputes arose from the attempts of some of the clergy to disengage themselves from the authority of the bishops; that the convocation had not the power to pass such censures on books as they desired; and that it was unprecedented that the bishops should be called to account for their conduct by the lower house of convocation.

On the 15th of March the convocation was prorogued

[p] The Complainer further reproved, &c. pp. 14, 15.

[q] Ib. 22; Act-Book, 1703-1704, Ms.

[r] Reynolds's Essay, 196, 197. They stated that the publication of such remarks on their proceedings was derogatory to the synod, and they referred to the orders of various convocations for secrecy.

by the president in a speech to the clergy, in which he told them that the greater part of their complaints required no answer, as they had been answered on previous occasions; that their former complaint against the Bishop of Sarum was insufficient, and that the present could not be considered. He particularly mentioned that the Bishop of Sarum had referred, in the charge of which they complained, to reports circulated to the prejudice of the upper house. He mentioned that a new convocation would be summoned, and that he should exert his authority, if necessary, in the next assembly. He said that the bishops would be governed by the articles and rubrics, the canons and statutes; and that the honour of convocation could alone be retrieved by departing from unwarrantable claims.[s]

In this speech the archbishop alluded to the "observations" of the bishops on the paper of the 1st of December. "You tell us, that we have hitherto vouchsafed you no manner of reply to your paper which was indeed, in many respects, of so undutiful a nature, that it might have been justly accounted an act of clemency in us to pass it by without censure. But yet, we drew up our 'observations' upon every branch of it; which after they had been approved and passed in form, and entered in our register, were thereby become part of the public acts of our house. Our deputy register had special and repeated directions to shew them freely to any person who should desire to peruse them; and we are also well assured that some, who concurred in this late complaint, understood several days before it was drawn up that our 'observations' were to be seen among the other acts and proceedings of this house. The proper place where they ought to be looked for by any one that has a mind to consult them is at Lambeth. There the *register* of convocation lives, and there the *registry* of the archbishop was before the civil wars, and there it still ought to be kept." He also told them that there

[s] The Complainer further reproved, pp. 34-40; Tindal's Cont. iii. 686, 687; Calamy, i. 665-669.

were no adjournments in convocations. "There is no such thing as an adjournment in the language and practice of convocation."[t] Yet, from the preceding pages, it will be seen that the term sometimes occurs.

The convocation met again on the 25th of October, 1705, with the new parliament. Dr. Stanhope preached the opening sermon, and Dr. Binks was chosen prolocutor. The composition of this convocation was similar to the former, the same members having been generally chosen.[u] The upper house agreed upon an address to her majesty, in which they censured those who raised the cry of the Church being in danger, and expressed their satisfaction with the state of things under her majesty's government. In reference to the danger of the Church, the bishops observe, that such a charge is very strange, when "several of the foreign Churches are endeavouring to accommodate themselves to our liturgy and constitution." The lower house refused to concur in this address, without assigning any reason for their refusal: and it was carried, that a separate address should be prepared. A committee was therefore appointed for the purpose. At their next meeting, the dean of Christ Church presented a form, which was adopted, and carried up by the prolocutor on the 12th of November.[z] The archbishop replied, that it could not

[t] Gibson Mss. vol. vi. 37; The Complainer further reproved, &c. pp. 33, 34.

[u] Burnet, ii. 412, 413; Boyer's Life of Queen Anne, 225. In refusing to concur in the address, the lower house alleged that it would be easier to frame a new one than to make amendments. Ib. 226.

[v] They acknowledged that the Church could be in no danger "from her majesty;" but they avoided saying that it was not in danger from others. Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 273, 274; Boyer, 227. It has been said that the practice of addressing the crown is modern. Yet Burnet, speaking of the refusal of the lower house to concur in the address from the bishops to the queen, says: "The bishops, according to ancient precedents, required them either to agree to their address, or to offer their objections against it." ii. 441. In 1704 Atterbury was appointed to the deanery of Carlisle, his old antagonist Nicolson being bishop of that see. The latter lost his temper and

be received, requesting them to retire and consider the address which had been sent down, or bring their exceptions in writing. They decided, however, that they should so notice the words in the message from the upper house, "*We cannot receive the address you have offered to us*," as to affirm their right of having their proposals received by the bishops. They also agreed not to depart from their former resolution of a separate address.[w] A paper to this effect was accordingly presented to the upper house on the 1st of December. Thus the address was permitted to fall; and all communications between the two houses ceased. The clergy held their intermediate sessions as before. On the 16th of December the Dean of Peterborough protested against such irregularities.

The convocation was prorogued until the 1st of February. On the 25th of February the queen sent a letter to the archbishop expressive of her concern at their differences, which were rather increased than abated. On the assembling of the convocation on the 1st of March, this letter was communicated to the lower house. During the recess a protestation was signed by more than fifty members of the lower house. Several were neutral; so that nearly one-half of the members separated from the rest, and sat no longer with them in their sessions. The protestation was not permitted to be read in the lower, but it was entered in the acts and proceedings of the upper house.[x] The queen commanded the archbishop to prorogue the convocation to such time as seemed most

his credit from his desire to revenge the old affront. Nicolson's Correspondence, i. 267-278, 285-287.

[w] Life of Queen Anne, i. 343. They asserted their own right to dissent. Boyer, 227.

[x] Tindal, iii. 733; Calamy, 688-690; Burnet, ii. 442. In the discussions on the protestation it was moved that the question should be adjourned to a full house; but before the motion was carried, the dean proceeded to the upper house, who thanked the protestors. Some Proceedings in Convocation, &c. pp 10, 12. Burnet says that the protestation was so secretly managed, though circulated through the province, that the majority knew

convenient. The members of the lower house were taken by surprise, for they do not appear to have contemplated a prorogation. Perceiving, therefore, that their sessions were to be terminated, they hastened to the door as fast as possible; nor was it without difficulty that they were induced to remain until the prorogation had been duly intimated. They returned, however, to their own house, where they continued to sit for a time, though they did not venture to pass any vote.[y]

It has been mentioned that the lower house would not suffer the protestation to be read: but it seems that they were not aware of the course which was taken by the protestors during the recess. The majority knew nothing of it until they met; and it was while they were engaged in deliberation respecting the protestors, that they were summoned to hear the letter from her majesty.

During this convocation a paper was drawn up by some members of the Irish synod, on the disputes in England. It had been solicited by some of the English clergy. The Irish members state that they had been requested by some of their brethren in England to give an account of their own practice. They first gave an answer to the prolocutor, and then committed it to writing. They state that the Irish members of the lower house of convocation, in 1705, were returned by the *præmunientes* clause in the bishops writs; but that the clergy deferred the election of a prolocutor until the reception of the provincial writs by the several archbishops. Further, they state that the lower

nothing of it till it was presented. Burnet, ii. 442. It was got up during the prorogation. Ib.

[y] Tindal, iii. 734; Calamy, i. 691; Burnet, ii. 442, 443; Tenison's Life, 105; Boyer, 228. When the convocation met in February, the lower house passed two papers; one a complaint of the protestation, the other a declaration of their rights. In the latter they claim the power of adjourning and of holding intermediate sessions. They also passed a third paper, retorting the charge of innovation in the protestors. Before the papers could be lodged with the bishops, the archbishop prorogued the convocation to the 1st of March. They now held their intermediate sessions. Some Proceedings in Convocation, 13-25.

house continued to sit till notice came from the bishops of an adjournment, and that they afterwards sat till a motion was made by a member for adjourning; when the custom was to adjourn to the time appointed by the upper house, or to a period within the space fixed by their lordships; and that this power of adjourning themselves was allowed by the prelates. It is stated, that frequently the lower house held intermediate sessions, which they look upon to be as regular as those which are concurrent with the sessions of the upper house, and do in their books style them sessions, and number them among others, without any discrimination.[z] This document was received in one of their intermediate sessions previous to the 1st of March. It may be mentioned, that in 1707, when the two members who gave the information were complained of in the Irish convocation, their course was justified by a large majority.[a]

[z] Wilkins, iv. 632, 633.

[a] Some Proceedings in Convocation, pp. 25-31. During the long period from Dec. 15 to Feb. 1, they did not, says this author, hold their intermediate sessions, though provoked by so long a prorogation, "and by a protestation of some of their own members received and encouraged by their lordships." Nor would they, he says, on the 1st of Feb. have directed an intermediate session, but for the further prorogation till March 1st, which shewed "a fixed resolution to break up the synod." Then they resumed "their intermitted rights;" and the writer asks, "Was there not a cause?" Some Proceedings in Convocation, pp. 1, 2. This work was published in 1707. In his preface the writer refers to the proceedings of previous convocations for the purpose of proving the peaceable intentions of the lower house, mentioning the Expedient and the Faithful Account, with the replies, Reflections on the Expedient and the Pretended Expedient. When the convocation met on the 1st of March, it was reported that some member had privately circulated Proceedings in the present Convocation, relating to the danger of the Church. Till that day the lower house knew nothing of the work. The pamphlet was printed, but not then published. An entry was made in the acts on the 1st of March, that any member who possessed a copy should produce it; "which no member would produce, though one of them acknowledged that he had one." At length one was found, and laid before them on the 1st of March. It was condemned as false and scandalous. Some Proceedings, &c. p. 2, 3. This author, alluding to the writer of the condemned pamphlet, says: "His name and his talent of writing history without any regard to truth are well known; and he hath of late given so many convincing proofs and instances of it, as

Before we proceed to the next meeting of the convocation, it is necessary to allude to a letter drawn up by the lower house, to be presented to the bishops, concerning books and writings. They allude to a previous request respecting a bill "for the more easy and speedy recovery of church-rates." The *Review* and the *Observator* are specified as licentious publications; and the theatre is condemned for its immoral practices. They state, that a congregation of Unitarians met publicly in London, and that the preacher had denied the divinity of the Saviour. There is also a reference to the reception of the English Liturgy by foreign Churches; for at this period several of the continental Churches expressed a readiness to adopt the ancient episcopal government; and it was considered that the previous reception of the Anglican Liturgy would soon lead to the adoption of the Anglican discipline. The king of Prussia was earnest in the matter; but the subject was permitted to drop by the queen's ministers.[b] The lower house ask for information on this subject, and how the convocation may express their satisfaction and readiness to maintain a friendly correspondence, so that the interests of religion may be maintained against the common enemy. But the most important point in their letter was the notice of a sermon which had been preached by Hoadly. Thus they observe: "They do in the last place earnestly desire your lordships, that some synodical notice may be taken of the dishonour done to the Church by a sermon preached by Mr. Benjamin Hoadly, at St. Lawrence Jewry, September 29, 1705, containing positions contrary to the doctrine of the Church, expressed in the first and second parts of the Homily against disobedience or wilful rebellion."[c]

have quite sunk the credit of his works, and put them upon a level with the visions of Varillas and Maimbourg." Ib.

[b] Sharpe's Life, i. 408-428, where all the particulars may be seen. Godwin de Præsul. art. Tenison.

[c] This sermon was alluded to, in a debate in the Lords on the question whether the Church was in danger, by Compton, Bishop of London; when

A book by Hickeringill was also censured; but Wall's *History of Infant Baptism* was publicly commended. It must be admitted, that the censures of the lower house respecting books, with the exception of Burnet's *Exposition*, were always just; nor were their commendations of others often misapplied. On these matters their course was marked by wisdom and prudence; and the only reason which prevented the concurrence of the bishops was the impression, that the convocation could not proceed to censure books in a judicial way without the royal license.[d]

In 1706 the convocation assembled again; and after some discussion respecting the form, the lower house concurred in an address to the queen, acknowledging that the Church was safe under her majesty. It was in this session of parliament that the question of the union with Scotland was discussed. Some of the clergy in convocation expressed their apprehensions on the subject; and committees were appointed to consider the dangers of the Church. A report was circulated that the lower house intended to address the Commons against the measure; but to prevent any such step, the queen ordered the archbishop, on the 12th of February, to prorogue them for three weeks. Recourse was had to this expedient in order that the clergy might not interpose by any address or petition. Before the expiration of the three weeks, the bill for the union of the two kingdoms had passed both houses of parliament.[e]

On assembling after the prorogation, the clergy complained, in a representation which was presented on the 19th of March to the bishops, that no such course had been pursued by the crown since the Act of Submission.

Burnet remarked, that his lordship was the last man to notice the subject, since, if the doctrine were unsound, he could not understand how his lordship would be able to justify his appearing in arms at Nottingham. Tindal's Cont. iii. 726; Wilkins, iv. 633, 634.

[d] Some Proceedings in Convocation, &c. pp. 33-35.

[e] Tindal's Cont. iii. 794; Burnet, ii. 470.

The representation was accompanied with a schedule containing the dates of previous prorogations, for the purpose of establishing their assertion. The document was submitted to the queen. On the 2d of April, 1707, the archbishop informed them that their statement was not correct; that the records had been searched; and that seven or eight similar prorogations had taken place during the meeting of parliament, while there were thirty or forty more, from which it appeared that the convocation sat sometimes before and sometimes after the parliament.[f] The archbishop again prorogued the convocation until the 10th of April; but the lower house continued their intermediate sessions. On the 8th of April the queen wrote to the archbishop, remarking that the representation of the lower house was an invasion of her supremacy. On the 10th of April, when the clergy were summoned to hear the queen's letter, the members appeared without their prolocutor; and, in reply to the question relative to the cause of his absence, it was said that he was gone into the country. The archbishop, therefore, proceeded to pass a sentence of contumacy against him for his absence, reserving, however, the declaration of the penalty until the 30th, to which day the convocation was prorogued by a schedule supported by a royal writ. Before that day a protestation was signed by some of the clergy; and on the day appointed for the meeting it was presented to the archbishop. In this document they stated, that it was the opinion of counsel, that no process commenced before a prorogation by royal writ could be continued. It was brought up by the prolocutor; and it was voted in the lower house, that the sentence of contumacy and the proceedings after the prorogation by writ were unlawful, and an invasion of the royal supremacy. The prolocutor, though urged by the majority to stand his ground, thought fit to submit to the archbishop, when the sentence was removed.[g]

[f] Tindal, iii. 794, 795; Burnet, ii. 471; Calamy, i. 713.

[g] Tindal, iii. 795; Burnet, ii. 471, 472; Calamy, i. 714.

On the 18th of April, Tenison addressed a circular to all his suffragans on the questions agitated in the convocation. It also contains the queen's letter of the 8th of April. The archbishop mentions all the particulars connected with the proceedings, desiring the bishops to communicate them to their clergy. In this letter, the application of the lower house on the 19th of March is given, and the archbishop states that the schedule of which they speak was not presented till the 26th. The archbishop adds, that the upper house would have caused an answer to be drawn up, but that they deemed it right not to take any further step in such an important matter until her majesty's pleasure should be known.[h]

No other business was transacted in this convocation. The members of the lower house were so refractory, that it was not possible to proceed with business. It was dissolved with the parliament.

[h] Cardwell's Documentary Annals, ii. 359-364. The archbishop says that he deemed it necessary to make the clergy acquainted with their proceedings. The clergy had stated that they had not been prorogued by a writ during a session of parliament from 1532 to 1705. This is denied by Tenison, and the clergy are charged with invading the supremacy. Some of the lower house presented a declaration to the effect, that they did not mean to question the validity of the royal prorogation. These papers were submitted to the queen, who issued her letter, in which she alludes to her resolution of February 1705 to maintain the supremacy, which, she says, was forced from her by the clergy, contrary to their duty. She designated their practices *illegal*, their reflections on the prorogation *untrue*, and their subsequent declaration *evasive*. This was the letter of April 8th. The archbishop adds "in justice to the cause of the royal supremacy, and inregard to the welfare of our Established Church, you will lay before the clergyof your diocese the foregoing account." This, however, was not the way to heal the breach. It was a mere cavil to allege the invasion of the supremacy. Wilkins, iv. 635, 636. It was argued in defence of the prolocutor's absence, that the clergy received no intimation that their presence would be required on the 10th, and that therefore they were surprised at the censure. An Account and Defence of the Protestation, April 30th, in behalf of the Queen's supremacy, 4to, 1707, pp. 1-5. The writer remarks that the archbishop doubted whether they could censure books without a license, but had no doubt about censuring a prolocutor. In 1701 a royal writ of prorogation was executed in the absence of the prolocutor without observation. Ib. 7, 8.

Much has been said in the preceding pages of the controversy which was carried on between Atterbury, Hill, and others, on the one side, and Wake, Kennet, and Hody, on the other; but there were some privileges recognised by both parties as necessarily belonging to the convocation. It is pleasant to find such a man as Brett taking a dispassionate view of the question. In allusion to a chapter in his work on *Provincial Synods*, he remarks, "I thought it therefore necessary, according to the best of my understanding, to vindicate those rights of an English convocation which have on all sides been asserted to belong to them; I mean, such as Bishop Wake, Dean Kennet, Dr. Hody, *Synodus Anglicana*, and those gentlemen who are most moderate in their pretensions have allowed. For which reason I have industriously avoided the making any quotations from the author of the *Letter to a Convocation-Man*, or from Dean Atterbury, or Mr. Archdeacon Hill, lest it might be said that they challenge more than the inferior clergy, or even provincial synods, ever had a right to; though I do not conceive they challenge more in any material points than what the others allow."[i]

[i] Brett on Church Government, preface. A list of the works on both sides from 1697, when the controversy commenced, to 1707, is given in Some Proceedings in Convocation. Richardson remarks that the disputes of this period proved the ruin of convocation, which has not since met to any purpose, while all dissenting bodies have their own assemblies. Godwin de Præsul. 167. After this controversy had somewhat abated, Gibson, who had been an active member of convocation, became a strenuous defender of the faith against a class of infidels by whom he was assailed with the most virulent abuse. The following passage, the fulfilment of which we have seen, merits our attention: "Though this admirable prelate has been libelled for this his excellent account and defence of our ecclesiastical constitution, by the title of Dr. Codex, and for the brave stand he made in favour of revealed religion has been dressed up like the primitive martyrs in order to be devoured by the infidel tribe, yet I am persuaded that his memory will be held in the highest honour when the very names of such wicked but weak revilers will be sunk in oblivion." Grey's Examination of Neal, iii. 321. Grey alludes especially to his Synodus Anglicana and the Codex.

CHAPTER XIII.

A.D. 1708-1714.

Convocation, 1708 — Another, 1710 — Atterbury prolocutor — License for business — Queen's Letter, containing subjects — They proceed to business — Whiston's case — Powers of Convocation in cases of Heresy — Judges consulted — Eight agree that Convocation has jurisdiction in cases of Heresy — Four take an opposite view — The view of the majority adopted by the Government — Whiston's Book condemned — Condemnation not confirmed by the Crown — Topics discussed — Prorogation — Convocation meets — Lay baptism — New Parliament and Convocation, 1713 — License for business — Topics — Dr. Clarke's case — A Form for the Reconciliation of Converts from Rome — Queen's Death — Books — The healing.

The convocation was convened with the new parliament in 1708, but it was prorogued by a royal writ from November to February, even before the customary sermon had been preached. Even then no business was transacted, and it was prorogued from time to time during this whole session of parliament.[a]

We come, therefore, to the year 1710, when the con-

[a] Somerville, 126, 338; Burnet, ii. 525, 526; Calamy, i. 720. The convocation was prorogued to prevent Atterbury's election as prolocutor. A curious letter was addressed by Lord Sunderland to the Dean of Gloucester, begging him to vote for Dr. Willis. Atterbury's Correspondence, ii. 309, 310. It was usual to attend prayers and sermon before the prolocutor was chosen; and Tenison broke in upon the customary course in consequence of the rumour that Atterbury was to be nominated. Tenison's Life, 108; Boyer's Queen Anne, 360, 361. We are informed that Kennet, because he was supposed to be one of the opponents of Sacheverel, "was often pointed at in the streets, and affronted in the aisles of the church, for refusing to pray for one under persecution." Kennet's Life, 102. Prayers were desired even in the queen's chapel *for Dr. Henry Sacheverel under persecution.* Palmer the clergyman was dismissed from his post. The Wisdom of Looking Backwards, p. 11.

vocation was assembled on the 25th of November. The sermon was preached by Kennet, and published by command of the archbishop.[b] Atterbury was chosen prolocutor, in opposition to Kennet, who was proposed by the moderate party in the convocation. Both these individuals had been engaged in the preceding controversy, and they were regarded as the leaders of their respective parties, so that the choice was decisive as to the views of the majority. On the 12th of December the queen, in a letter to the archbishop, expressed her hope that the convocation would be able to repress the loose principles which had been broached, intimating that she should afford them every encouragement in her power. From the tone of the letter it is clear that Atterbury's influence prevailed, through the minister, when it was prepared.

An address to the queen was drawn up by the bishops, in which they express their determination to check the growth of atheism, heresy, superstition, and schism. When it was sent to the lower house, a member called for the queen's letter to be read. Smallridge was the individual. It was then remarked that the bishop's address did not sufficiently allude to the scandalous principles mentioned by the queen. Gaskell spoke with great effect; some argued for amendments, others for a concurrence with the upper house. Under these circumstances the archbishop prorogued the convocation two days; when, not agreeing, they were prorogued until the 17th of the next month, January. At this step many were offended. On meeting again, her majesty's license was brought by Lord Dartmouth, dated January 23. An address to the queen was now concurred in by both houses, and presented on the 26th of January. It was a new address, and shorter than the preceding.[c]

[b] Kennet's Life, 105.

[c] Proceedings of Convocation, Mss. 1710, no. 17; History of Parliament and Convocation, 8vo, pp. 110-122; Boyer's Anne, 489-491. The account of the prorogation from Dec. 25th to Jan. 17th was given by the Examiner,

The license was followed by a second letter to the archbishop, stating that the convocation were allowed to confer, treat, debate, and consult and agree upon matters to be laid before them. It also contained certain heads of subjects for discussion.

"The drawing-up a representation of the present state of religion among us, with regard to the late excessive growth of infidelity, heresy, and profaneness.

"The regulating the proceedings in excommunications, and reforming the abuses of commutation—money.

"The preparing a form for the visitation of prisoners, and particularly condemned persons. For admitting converts from the Church of Rome, and such as shall renounce their errors. For restoring those who have relapsed.

"The establishing rural deans where they are not, and rendering them more useful where they are.

"The making provision for preserving and transmitting more exact terriers, and accounts of glebes, tithes, and other possessions and profits belonging to benefices.

"The regulating licenses for matrimony, according to the canon, in order to the more effectual preventing of clandestine marriages."[d]

This second letter was dated the 29th of January, 1710, from St. James's Palace.[e]

and led to a defence of the archbishop. The author enters upon the question of the rights claimed by the archbishop, admitting the final negative of the lower house, their right to petition the crown for redress of grievances and for reformation, and the power to appoint committees in matters connected with their own house. The Case of the Present Convocation considered, in answer to the Examiner's unfair Representation, 8vo, 1711, pp. 11, 12, 18 When the lower house demanded a sight of the queen's letter, a clause was prepared for insertion in the address ; but it was deemed insufficient by the clergy, and a committee was appointed to frame one, which was rejected by the bishops, and then the archbishop prorogued the convocation. Ib. Life of Queen Anne, ii. 309, 310; Wisdom of Looking Backward, 93, 94. The first license was brought to the convocation on the 24th. Ib. 105.

[d] Life of Queen Anne, ii. 336-339 ; Wilkins, iv. 636, 638 ; Boyer, 491.

[e] We are informed that this year the 5th of November, which since the revolution "had been justly observed as a day of double deliverance, was by

It should be observed that there had been a change in the administration, so that the lower house were more in favour with the government than had formerly been the case. There was a change also in the license; for the archbishop was not, as was usual on former occasions, nominated president, neither was he consulted previous to its being issued. Certain bishops were mentioned as a *quorum*, before whom it was understood that all matters were to be brought. The records were searched, and the report submitted to the queen; after which a message was returned to the effect that she did not intend that the bishops named as a *quorum* should preside in or have a negative on their deliberations.[f] It was supposed that Atterbury, who was in the confidence of the premier, was the cause of these proceedings.

The convocation at length entered upon the matters submitted to them in the queen's letter. In the lower house the state of the Church was the question which was first agitated. It was agreed that a representation on the subject should be drawn up; but after a little progress had been made, and a few heads settled, it was further agreed that the management should be left to Atterbury.

many of the inferior clergy reduced to the first occasion only; and no mention was made of the landing of King William in their sermons." Wisdom of Looking Backwards, 83. Two years later the same thing is mentioned. "A letter from London excusing the clergy for mangling the service of the Church on the 5th of November, and omitting those collects, &c. relating to King William." Ib. 257.

[f] Burnet, ii. 560, 570; Tindal's Cont. iv. 207; History of Parliament and Convocation, 131, 132. Burnet says that the archbishop and bishops were not consulted about the license. ii. 570. A new license was sent Feb. 16, appointing the archbishop president, and adding other bishops to the quorum. Burnet remarks that the new license was sent because the archbishop and the Bishop of London were ill, and the Bishop of Bath and Wells refused to act. Ib. Boyer's Anne, 491. The queen's letter of the 29th was received on the 31st. Ib. 109, 110. Kennet, noticing the letter, says: "These things looked plausible for the Church, but were suspected to be meant for the state only; and to blacken the late ministry; as if the new set were all Christians and saints." Ib. 110.

Entrusted with such powers, he drew up a "representation on the state of the Church," in which the administration ever since the Revolution, according to Burnet, was reflected on in terms of great severity. The draft was carried, as a matter of course, in the lower house, but rejected by the bishops, who ordered another to be prepared in more general terms. Other matters were discussed and settled in one house, but not being sanctioned by both, nothing was concluded.[g]

At this time the attention of convocation was directed to the views entertained and advocated by Whiston, the mathematical professor at Cambridge. Burnet calls it an incident. "An incident happened," says he, "that diverted their thoughts to another matter." He was removed from his post in Cambridge by the University, after which he published a vindication of himself, and dedicated it to the convocation. From what has been stated in previous

[g] A committee of five bishops and ten presbyters was appointed to consider the more important matters arising out of the queen's letter, while other things were entrusted to different committees. That on the state of religion was the chief. Boyer's Anne, 492. The House of Commons took into consideration the want of churches in London, and the thanks of the lower house of convocation were presented to them by the prolocutor. Afterwards the commons resolved to receive information on such subjects from the lower house of convocation; upon which the prolocutor gave in a scheme for new churches. These proceedings led to the erection of fifty new churches in this reign, which are now some of the most important in London. The scheme originated in convocation, though it was carried into effect by parliament. Atterbury's Correspondence, ii. 312-314; History of the Parliament and Convocation, 134-138; Boyer's Anne, 492, 493. Kennet says of this matter: "Whence many thought that the piety of building churches was a political project for ingratiating with the Church and clergy; however, it produced an irregular correspondence between the House of Commons and the inferior clergy, without the consent of the bishops, and in derogation to the queen's supremacy." Wisdom, &c. 115, 116. The convocation also addressed the queen on this subject. History of present Parliament and Convocation, 108-110; Life of Queen Anne, ii. 339-342. Kennet says that the address to the queen was sent in consequence of a reproof from the court to the prolocutor for applying elsewhere, when her majesty's desires for the Church were so well known. Wisdom, &c. 119.

chapters, the reader will gather that it was doubtful what the powers of the convocation were in a case of heresy. The lower house, however, proceeded to take it into consideration, and in March presented a paper on the subject to the archbishop. The particular book in question was entitled, *An historical Preface to Primitive Christianity revived.* They stated that it contained assertions opposed to the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. The archbishop addressed the bishops on the subject, agreeing in opinion with the clergy, that the book should be noticed by convocation, and stating that two points were especially to be considered; first, the censure of the book and its doctrines; secondly, the censure of the author. To censure the book, two things were necessary: first, to examine it and to make a selection of passages; secondly, to fix the passages of Scripture, in the council of Nice and in the Thirty-nine Articles, upon which a charge of heresy might be grounded. The archbishop also stated that the book might be censured in convocation, provided certain difficulties were removed, especially the Act of the 1st of Queen Elizabeth, from which it would seem that all jurisdiction respecting heresy was annexed to the crown. There was also another difficulty, namely, that the High Commission Court, in which such matters had been adjudicated, was suppressed after the Restoration, when it was enacted that no similar court should be erected. So that it was necessary to consider whether the revival of the judicial authority of the convocation was the erection of such a court. Two other methods presented themselves in such a case: first, the archbishop might hold a court of audience, his suffragans being present, and then examine into and give sentence in the cause; or secondly, the bishop of the diocese might cite the offender into his own court. The archbishop considered that the two last-mentioned plans were encumbered with the fewest difficulties. Another letter was addressed by the archbishop to the bishops, dated the 11th of April, 1711, containing one from Whis-

ton to his grace. As the case was involved in difficulties, the upper house presented an address to her majesty on the subject, stating the offence alleged against Whiston, namely, that he had advanced certain positions which were damnable and blasphemous against the doctrine of the Trinity, expressly *contradicting the two fundamental articles of the Nicene creed, and defaming the whole Athanasian.* They then express their desire to repress blasphemy, according to the powers granted by her majesty's license; but state that certain doubts had arisen respecting their powers. They were especially in doubt on one point, namely, whether an appeal would lie from the convocation to the crown, the convocation being a final court, and appeals from it not being specified in the Statute of Appeals in the time of Henry VIII., while the statute of Elizabeth annexed all jurisdiction to the crown. Under these circumstances they beseech her majesty to submit the case to the consideration of the judges.[h]

Accordingly the judges were consulted; and *eight* of the *twelve,* with the attorney and solicitor-general, concurred in opinion that the convocation had a jurisdiction in cases of heresy. They agreed that there was by common right an appeal to her majesty from all ecclesiastical courts, by virtue of the supremacy, whether given by express words of an act of parliament or not; that such power had not been taken away by act of parliament; and that consequently a prosecution in convocation, not excluding an appeal to her majesty, was not inconsistent with the act of the 1st of Queen Elizabeth. They further agreed that jurisdiction in matters of heresy might be exercised in convocation, no law, as they believed, having taken it away. But a reservation was made. They stated that, "this being a matter which, upon application for a prohibition

[h] Convocation Proceedings, Mss.; Tindal's Cont. iv. 207; Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 755-759; Wisdom of Looking Backward, 125, 131; Whiston's Life, 217-219.

on behalf of the persons who shall be prosecuted, may come in judgment before such of us as have the honour to serve your majesty in places of judicature, we desire to be understood to give our present thoughts with a reserve of an entire freedom of altering our opinions, in case any records or proceedings, which we are now strangers to, shall be laid before us, or any new considerations, which have not occurred to us, be suggested by the parties, or their counsel, to convince us of our mistakes."

Four of the judges came to a different conclusion. They gave it as their opinion that since the Statute of Appeals in the time of Henry VIII., the convocation had no jurisdiction in cases of heresy, but that the ecclesiastical courts, from which appeals would lie to the crown, were the proper places in which such matters should be decided. They thought that such a power in the convocation would be an invasion of the rights of the archbishops and bishops in their various courts.

Her majesty's council adopted the views of the majority of the judges; and an answer to that effect was addressed to the archbishop, so that the convocation was authorised to proceed. There were other difficulties respecting the author, namely, whether the lower house were to take part in the proceedings, or whether the sentence should be confirmed by the convocation of York. In consequence of these difficulties, the bishops resolved on commencing with the book, for on that point no doubt now existed as to their jurisdiction. Their inquiry was to ascertain whether it contained positions contrary to Scripture and to the decisions of the *first four* general councils, which are the standards appointed by law in cases of heresy.[i]

Under these circumstances the book was proceeded with. Certain propositions were extracted and censured as *Arian* in their tendency; and having been agreed upon

[i] Tindal, iv. 208; Burnet, ii. 572, 573.

by the bishops, they were sent down to the lower house, who concurred in the censure; so that the passages were condemned by the authority of the whole convocation. In one passage Whiston asserts, that *the Arian doctrine on the subject of the Trinity was the true doctrine;* in another, that when the Scriptures speak of one God, *they mean one supreme God the Father only;* in others, that *the Son is inferior and subordinate to the Father,* that *the Son was created only before the world,* and that *the Holy Ghost is inferior and subordinate to the Father.* Other positions of a similar kind were also extracted, and embodied in the judgment or censure of the convocation. They therefore concluded:

"We do declare that the above-mentioned passages do contain assertions false and heretical, injurious to our Saviour and the Holy Spirit, repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, and contrariant to the decrees of the two first General Councils, and to the Liturgy and Articles of our Church."

On the 30th of May the prolocutor presented a letter to the bishops, which had been addressed to him by Whiston, and delivered by Emlyn, the Unitarian preacher, at the door of the convocation-house. In this letter he asks for a copy of the propositions extracted from his writings. The request was considered to be reasonable by the lower house, who agreed that he should be permitted to make *his explication and apology* respecting the extracts. They concluded with a request that he should be cited before the convocation for that purpose.

The judgment of the convocation was sent to her majesty, who promised to take it into consideration; but on the 12th of June the convocation closed, and no answer had been forwarded. When the convocation assembled in the ensuing winter, two bishops were deputed to wait upon the queen for the purpose of obtaining her assent to the censure; but an excuse was made that the document could not be found. Other messengers were afterwards

sent; but it was said that the queen could not remember to whom she had given the paper. Thus, under the shelter of the crown, Whiston escaped altogether. The book was condemned by the convocation, but the condemnation could not be carried into effect because it was not confirmed by the crown. Burnet expresses his satisfaction that nothing was done; but, surely, to suffer the matter to be altogether laid aside was not the way to support the Anglican Church or the cause of religion.[j]

We must now retrace our steps a little, in order to consider some other proceedings of this convocation. We have seen that the *representation* on the state of the Church, drawn up by Atterbury, and sanctioned by the lower house, was rejected by the bishops, who ordered another to be prepared. When it had been confirmed by the upper house, it was sent down to the clergy, who refused to adopt it; and in consequence of these differences no paper of the kind was presented to her majesty.

The topics recommended by the queen were considered by the upper house, and certain regulations, founded on them, were adopted. A report was agreed upon by both houses respecting excommunications and the commutation of penance, also concerning glebes and tithes; and several points were considered by the two houses separately.[k]

[j] Tindal, iv. 208-254; Somerville, 426; Burnet, ii. 573, 603; Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 764-769; Wilkins, iv. 646-651; Book of Lower House, 1711; Tenison Mss. vol. 803. This volume contains a letter from the archbishop, dated May 9th, 1711, to his substitute in the president's chair, saying that he has reviewed the opinions of the judges, and requests that they may be communicated to the house. In the Tenison Mss. is a prayer-book with certain proposed changes marked in the margin, and an anonymous letter which had accompanied the volume. The writer proposes that his alterations should be adopted by convocation. He asks for changes on the ground of the refinement of the age. Tenison Mss. vol. 1051.

[k] Wilkins, iv. 639, 640. The Irish convocation appear to have coincided in view with the lower house in England. They address the lord-lieutenant, saying that to him they owed "the restitution of their right to sit in convocation with every parliament." The lower house, addressing the bishops, thanked them for their regard to their rights since their restoration. They especially thank the bishops for their resolution of Aug. 5th, 1700, "wherein

Certain questions respecting rural deans were discussed in both houses, and some points were settled after mutual conferences. It was suggested that a canon should be drawn up to define and fix their duties, and making a special provision that they should be clergymen beneficed in the diocese. The bishops suggested that the clergy should select persons to fill the office, subject to the approval of the bishop; and it is singular that the lower house proposed an alteration, recommending that the choice should be in the archdeacons instead of the clergy.[1] After several papers had passed between the two houses, the business dropped. The last paper from the lower house was dated June 5th, and the convocation was prorogued on the 12th; so that nothing was actually concluded except the condemnation of Whiston's book.

There is some mystery about "the representation on the state of religion;" but the case appears to be as follows. There was a joint committee of both houses, by whom a paper was passed. When it came before the lower house of convocation, various amendments were added. It was laid before the bishops, who disapproved of it, and prepared one of their own; so that nothing was carried. In this document, which professes to have been drawn up by the joint committee, there is an allusion to the spread of infidelity and Socinianism, as well as to the efforts of Rome. Whiston's book and some works of Quakers are mentioned, and also the licentiousness of the stage. Of the Romanists it says, "they have swarmed in our streets of late years, and have been very busy in making converts; and since their known way of dealing in such cases is to bring men round to infallibility by the

your graces and lordships, with a primitive courage, truly declare that the convocation of Ireland have a right to be summoned and meet with every parliament; and that the members ought and may freely debate and give their opinions in all matters that shall come before them." Life of Queen Anne, ii. 375-377.

[1] Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 738-753; Wilkins, iv. 641-645.

way of infidelity, we doubt not but their subtle arts and restless endeavours of this kind may be reckoned one cause of the present growth of irreligion among us." Such was the paper submitted to the bishops. But now comes the mystery. It is said that the document was neither that which was agreed upon by the joint committee, nor yet that which was amended by the lower house, but a different production. The paper from the joint committee was submitted to a committee of the whole lower house, by whom various insertions and amendments were added. It is supposed that these were chiefly introduced by Atterbury; and hence the report that the business was principally entrusted to his management. But it is not easy to reconcile this notion with Kennet's statement, that Rouse, the actuary, attested that the paper called a representation was not a true copy of that which passed the joint committees, or that which was amended by the lower house. At all events, the bishops rejected the paper which was submitted to them, by a vote of nine against seven. Three of the bishops who had voted for it in the committee, now voted against it in its altered state. Another was sent down to the lower house and rejected.[m]

[m] History of Parliament and Convocation, 250-291; Memoirs of Queen Anne, 8vo, 1729, 107-109; Atterbury's Correspondence, ii. 315, 316, 340-349; Wisdom of Looking Backwards, 130-132. Alluding to the Examiner's Account of the differences on the Representation, Kennet says: "The examiner always wrote in opposition to the archbishop, and was a professed advocate of the prolocutor and the lower house, which made some people expect that one of the writers was one of the inferior clergy, or constantly instructed and prompted by the chair." Wisdom of Looking, &c. 133. He gives the following under June 20th, 1711: "A private letter that the lord bishop of S. had reported even in the House of Lords that the Lord T——r had frequently boasted to his friends that he had *bamboozled the convocation*, *i. e.* set them to work for amusement only, and a little to burn their own fingers." Ms. Ib. 132. A bishop of the period says of his brethren: "The bishops for these twenty years have behaved themselves with that good temper, moderation, and paternal gentleness, that they have gained more ground upon the hearts of the Dissenters than had been done in a hundred years before; and yet they have not parted with one point of doctrine, one point

In the autumn of the same year, 1711, the parliament was again convened; and the convocation assembled in December. Some doubts were expressed whether the queen's license continued in force after a prorogation. The attorney-general considered that it did; and accordingly the bishops resumed, and proceeded with the business which had been suspended by the prorogation. They therefore sent back a letter which had been forwarded to them the previous year, having made certain amendments. Atterbury, however, contended that every thing must be commenced afresh in consequence of the prorogation, as was the case in parliament. This objection led to a search into the books, when it was clearly ascertained that a contrary practice had prevailed, and that the schedule of prorogation continued all things in the same state until the next meeting. Still, the lower house, at the instigation of Atterbury, refused to concur in the view taken by the bishops, and consequently the subjects suggested by the queen were not proceeded with.[n]

of discipline, one line of the Common Prayer, nor one external ceremony." Bishop of St. Asaph's Charge, 1712, p. 69. A pamphlet appeared against the Representation, entitled the Nation Vindicated, in which the writer denies that the state of matters with respect to religion was so dark. The Representation had mentioned that certain publications of an infidel tendency, which would have been forgotten, had lately been collected into volumes and republished. It was supposed that the convocation referred to the two volumes of the Phœnix, published by Dunton; and the author of the Nation Vindicated produces a paper from the publisher, who declares that his only object was to preserve curious works without reference to party. He also mentions the curious fact that the preface to the second volume was written by the Rev. Christopher O'Bryen, a non-juring clergyman. The Nation Vindicated from the Aspersions cast upon it in a late pamphlet intituled a Representation, &c. 8vo, 1711, part ii. pp. 22, 23.

[n] Tindal, iv. 254; Burnet, ii. 602; Wilkins, iv. 637-654. During the year 1711 several works were published on the controversy which had so long existed between the two houses. The Mitre and the Crown, or a real Distinction between them, in a Letter to a Reverend Member of the Convocation; and a Continuation of the Mitre and the Crown, in 1712, were in favour of the independent rights of the convocation. Both these productions, however, are written in a moderate tone. In the Somers Tracts, xii. 302, the Mitre and the Crown is ascribed to Atterbury.

A motion was made in the lower house to censure a sermon by Dr. Brett, in which he had advanced some very strong views on priestly absolution.[o] The motion, however, came to nothing. The question of lay baptism was also introduced into the lower house, many of the members contending that it was not valid. The bishops therefore drew up a declaration on the subject, in which they assert the irregularity of all baptism not performed by persons in holy orders; but they declared at the same time, that, according to the practice of the primitive Church and the usage of the Church of England, baptism with water, and in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, should not be repeated, even though the ordinance had been performed by a layman. The Archbishop of York agreed at first to this declaration; but afterwards refused his signature, on the ground that it would encourage irregular baptism. It was agreed to in the upper house, with the exception of the Bishop of Rochester and the Archbishop of York; but the lower house refused even to take it into consideration. Their reasons for refusing appear to me to be wise and prudent. They were to this effect: that the Catholic Church, and the Anglican Church in particular, had hitherto avoided any synodical determination on the subject; that the inconveniences attending such a determination would outweigh the convenience proposed, especially at a time when the authority of the Christian priesthood and the succession in the ministry were openly denied, or undervalued. Waterland admitted that the Church did not determine either way. The matter was therefore permitted by the convocation to remain

[o] It was the sermon on remission of sins. Kennet published a Letter to the Rev. Thomas Brett, &c. about a matter in convocation. Kennet's Life, 129; Wisdom, &c. 194. Cannon made the motion in convocation, and published his account of the proceedings. Brett published a defence of his views. Cannon's Account of Two Motions of Convocation, 8vo, 1712; Brett's Doctrine, &c. explained and vindicated, in Remarks on Dr. Cannon's Account, &c. 8vo, 1712.

in the state in which the Church had previously left it, though in her practice she allows of no baptism not performed by a regularly ordained minister.[p]

But though the Church of England has not synodically declared against the validity of lay baptism, yet she never gave any countenance to baptism by those who dissented from her communion. A case occurred in the Court of Arches in 1841, in which the court decided that dissenting baptism was the same as lay baptism, against which the Church has not decided. It is said, therefore, that the Church allows of lay baptism. In the early Church, undoubtedly, it was allowed in cases of necessity. Many testimonies on this head are given by Bingham. The rubrics in the first and second books of King Edward, and also in that of Queen Elizabeth, leave the matter doubtful. The persons present were to call upon God, and one of them was to dip the child in water. In consequence of this rubric, laymen, and even midwives, did sometimes, in cases of danger, administer the sacred rite; and such baptism was not disallowed. At the period of the Hampton Court conference, there was a doubt whether laymen were allowed to baptise; so that it is evident that the practice was not then continued. The king remarked, "If called private from the place, I think it agreeable with the use of the primitive Church; but if termed private, that any besides a lawful minister may baptise, I utterly dislike it." The Archbishop of Canterbury argued that it was not allowed by the Church; but the king replied, that the rubric must intend to give permission to private persons to baptise. The Bishop of Worcester said, that the compilers of the book did not so intend; and the Bishop of London stated that they intended to allow it in cases of necessity. The Bishop of Worcester added, that the compilers propounded the words ambiguously, because

[p] Life of Archbishop Sharp, i. 372-376; Tindal, iv. 255; Burnet, ii. 604, 605; Kennet's Life, 112; Wisdom of, &c. 237-239.

otherwise the book might not have been sanctioned by the parliament.[q]

But it can scarcely be said that the rubrics sanctioned the practice, for they must be interpreted by the Articles; and the twenty-third declares, that it is not lawful for any one to take upon himself to preach and minister the sacraments. By this article, therefore, a layman was no more at liberty to administer one sacrament than the other. But in the year 1575, the convocation, as has been previously stated, declared that the sense of the Church was against the practice; and in 1604, when the revised Book of Common Prayer was published, the question was set at rest by an alteration of the rubric, by which the administration of the rite is confined to lawful ministers. It is singular, that at the Hampton Court conference the Puritans argued against baptism by laymen. It is clear, therefore, that the rubrics in the old Books of Common Prayer were not always interpreted so as to countenance lay baptism. Yet that the practice existed there can be no doubt whatever; and when once it had been administered, no matter by whom, the rite was not to be repeated.

It is argued by some, that though the Church discourages lay baptism, she does not pronounce it null and void.[r] But this argument is not satisfactory; for by the

[q] Barlow's Account of the Conference. Fuller, x. 7-24.

[r] Sharp on the Rubrics, 41. One of the Mar-prelate tracts proves the practice as well as the fact that the Puritans objected. In a Dialogue, wherein is plainly laid open the Tyrannical Dealings of Lord Bishops against God's children, we have these lines relative to practices rejected by the Puritans:

> "Roodes in the windows and the marriage ring,
> The churching vaile and midwives christening."

In the controversy between Fleetwood on one side with Laurence Brett and others on the opposite, the question of baptism when no necessity could be pleaded was not touched. All parties agreed that a necessity must be shewn to justify the practice; consequently baptism by Dissenters was not contemplated. Bingham, who argued for the practice, says that the Church has no rule for rebaptising those "who in time of necessity were baptised by laymen." Bingham's Works, viii. preface v. So that the Court of Arches,

alteration of the rubric, and the substitution of the words *lawful minister*, the Church has surely declared against the practice, even though she has not put forth a public declaration on the subject. The catechism seems to confirm this position; for it declares that the sacraments are only *generally necessary to salvation*, not *essentially necessary*. Consequently, in the judgment of the Church of England, baptism is not *absolutely* necessary to salvation, but only *generally* necessary, as a duty, whenever it can be properly administered by a lawful minister according to the rubric.

But this question of lay baptism is totally different from that of baptism by Dissenters. It is admitted, and must be admitted, that the Church never sanctioned the practice except in cases of absolute necessity. How then can necessity be pleaded in the case of Dissenters? In the cases in which it was allowed by the Church, the rite was administered in a private chamber, when the child was in danger and a clergyman could not be procured; whereas dissenting baptism is publicly administered to children in health, and in places where the ministers of the Church are ready to administer that sacrament as often as they are called upon to do so. It may be remarked, that the Dissenter argues that *his* baptism is as valid as our own. The parties, however, who wish to place *dissenting* on the same footing with *lay baptism* are members of the Church of England.

There is another consideration, which ought not to be lost sight of in this matter. The baptism by laymen in England subsequent to the Reformation was still administered by members of the Church, not by persons in a state of separation. Though, therefore, the Church did, in cases of necessity, admit of lay baptism, she never could have contemplated baptism by Dissenters; for the parties who performed it were her own members. This is a point of great importance in the controversy. In the case of lay baptism, as formerly allowed, its validity rested, not on

in pronouncing for the validity of Dissenters' baptism, regarded it only as lay baptism.

any supposed right of the person to baptise, but on the authority of the ecclesiastical governors, who permitted the practice. I am aware that, by the decisions in the Court of Arches, a clergyman is bound to read the funeral service over persons who have been baptised by Dissenters; but this is quite a different question, and in no way affects the other question, whether the Church admits the validity of baptism when so administered. The law of the land may impose a duty on the ministers of the Church, and they readily perform the duty; but it by no means follows from this circumstance that the Church recognises *dissenting* as valid baptism.

The parliament was summoned in February 1713, and the convocation met on the 16th. Both houses concurred in an address to her majesty. Dr. Stanhope was chosen to the office of prolocutor.[s] Her majesty had recently recovered from an alarming illness, and the two houses, in their address, congratulated her on her recovery, praying also that her life might be continued, and that after a long and happy reign, she might be able to transmit the protection of the Church and State to a Protestant *successor* in *the illustrious house of Hanover*. The address was presented on the 6th of March; and on the 17th the convocation was authorised by a royal letter to proceed to

[s] In 1712 Fleetwood's preface to Four Sermons was condemned by the Commons to be burned by the public hangman, on the alleged ground of reflecting on the ministry. It is said that the Whigs printed it as a broadside. Calamy says he forgot his resentment against Fleetwood when he read a passage in this preface. It appears that Fleetwood had said of Calamy's Abridgement: "These Dissenters can abridge any thing but their malice." Wisdom of, &c. 233; Calamy's Hist. Account, ii. 473; Life of Queen Anne, ii. 473; Boyer's Anne, 578. A satirical pamphlet was published against Fleetwood; and, alluding to the burning of the preface, the writer says: "This will add a never-failing lustre to your character when future ages shall read how a few pages could alarm the representative body of the nation. I know your lordship would rather live in a blaze than be buried in obscurity, and would at any rate rather purchase immortality though it be in flames." A Letter of Thanks from my Lord W——n to the Lord Bishop of St. Asaph, in the name of the Kit-Cat Club, 8vo, 1712, p. 13.

business. Certain heads or topics were suggested in this letter; namely, the regulation of proceedings in excommunications, the preparation of forms for the visitation of prisoners, for admitting converts from the Church of Rome and for restoring those who had relapsed, for the establishment of rural deans, together with the regulation of terriers and marriage-licenses.[t]

The bishops undertook the regulation of the abuses in excommunications, the preparation of forms for the visitation of prisoners, for admitting converts from Rome, and for restoring those who had relapsed. The other matters were left to the consideration of the lower house. On the 8th of July the convocation was prorogued by the Bishop of London, who acted as president. He thanked the clergy for the progress they had made in the business submitted to their consideration. Certain points respecting excommunications had been agreed upon by both houses; but he observed, that they could not be submitted in a perfect form to the queen at present, though they would be laid before her in their present state. The bishops expressed their hope, that at the next meeting the other heads would be so finished, that canons might be framed, and full effect given to them by the subscription of both houses.

In the following spring the convocation assembled again, when the lower house resolved to address the queen on the peace. The bishops sent a form, to which the clergy objected, as not expressing *a becoming joy*, nor a due confidence in her majesty; so they prepared another. During a prorogation, the lower house waited on her majesty with their own address, which was graciously received. The bishops had rejected the form of the lower house on the 13th of May, because it was regarded as disrespectful to their lordships, and "a repetition of an attempt which

[t] Proceedings of Convocation, Ms.; Life of Queen Anne, i. 574-576; Cardwell, ii. 776; Wilkins, iv. 654-656. In July an Account of the Proceedings of the Lower House was published. It was considered unfair. Wisdom of, &c. 293, 294.

was never persisted in only in the case of the address sent down by the upper house, November 14, 1705."[u] Samuel Clarke was complained of in this convocation. It appears that he was in the habit of omitting portions of the Liturgy. On Trinity Sunday, 1713, in order to avoid reading the proper preface in the communion-service, he omitted the administration of the Lord's Supper altogether, at which many persons were greatly distressed. The queen was offended at his conduct, and removed him from his post of royal chaplain. His *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* was also published, in which certain unsound positions were maintained; and these two circumstances, the publication of the book and the omission of the communion, made it clear that he held some strange opinions respecting the doctrine of the Trinity. The lower house, therefore, applied to the bishops on the 2d of June, 1714. They stated that the book was at variance with the Catholic faith of the Church of England; and further, they requested the upper house to take the matter into their most serious consideration. The bishops requested them to specify the obnoxious parts in writing; and on the 23d of June they presented a paper of extracts, declaring their belief that the passages fully supported their representation respecting the erroneous character of the book.

At this stage of the inquiry, Dr. Clarke drew up a qualifying paper concerning his faith, and presented it to the upper house. In this document a different view was maintained from that which was conveyed by the extracts from the book; he also promised not to preach on the subject, nor yet to publish any other books on the Trinity. In this declaration he stated that the third and fourth petitions in the Litany had never been omitted in his church, and that the Athanasian Creed had not been omitted at eleven o'clock prayers, but only at early prayers

[u] Wisdom of Looking Backward, &c. 280, 281; Memoirs of Queen Anne, 236, 237.

for the sake of brevity, by his curate, and not by his own appointment.

Soon after, the doctor sent a second explanation to the Bishop of London, in which he declared that his views, as expressed in the former paper, were not different from those which he had maintained in his books. He desired, therefore, that the declaration might be so understood, and not as a retractation of any thing which he had written.

The upper house expressed themselves satisfied with these explanations, and informed the lower house that they did not think fit to proceed further with the extracts submitted to their notice. The lower house, on the contrary, resolved that Dr. Clarke had made no retractation, and that his paper was not satisfactory.[v]

Some other matters were transacted in this convocation, though nothing was confirmed. *A form for admitting converts from the Church of Rome, and such as shall renounce their errors,* was prepared. It is destitute of authority, because it was not regularly carried through both houses; but it is occasionally used in the case of converts from the Church of Rome. Our bishops may indeed adopt on such occasions any form which may commend itself to their own judgments, or they may prepare a form for their own use; but it is probable that a prelate would prefer this, inasmuch as, though not binding, it has been partly sanctioned by a convocation. It was drawn up at the command of the queen, probably by Archbishop Wake. The form, moreover, is admirably adapted for the purpose. It is very comprehensive, very pointed, and very scriptural. The questions proposed to the converts relate to the Scriptures as containing all *doctrine requisite and necessary to eternal*

[v] Life of Queen Anne, ii. 581-587; Tindal's Cont. iv. 412-414; Somerville, 564; Wilkins, iv. 657-659; a Full Account of the late Proceedings in Convocation relating to Dr. Clarke's Writings, &c. 8vo, 1714; Whiston's Life of Clarke, 1730, 8vo, p. 74-76, 82-84; Books of Lower House, 1713, 1714.

salvation, to *the articles in the Apostles' Creed*, and to the renunciation of the errors of the Church of Rome.[w]

Another form was prepared under this title, *an exhortation to be read in the church when the person decreed to be excommunicated is present*. There were certain passages within brackets, which were to be omitted in those cases in which the offending parties were not present.[x]

These matters, with others which had been recommended by the crown, were in progress in convocation, when their proceedings were stayed by the death of the queen, which took place on the first day of August 1714.

In connexion with the subjects of *penance*, *excommunication*, and certain other kindred topics, which were discussed in convocation during this reign, two very valuable works may be noticed.[y] They are written in a tone of

[w] The following may be taken as a sample :

"Do you earnestly desire to be received into the communion of this Church, as into a true and sound part of Christ's holy Catholic Church ?

Answer : This I earnestly desire.

Do you renounce all the errors and superstitions of the present Church of Rome, so far as they are come to your knowledge ?

Answer : I do from my heart renounce them all.

Do you in particular renounce the last twelve Articles added in the Confession, commonly called the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, after having read them and duly considered them ?

Answer : I do, upon mature deliberation, reject them all, as grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.

Will you conform yourself to the Liturgy of the Church of England ?

Answer : I will.

Then the bishop, or priest, standing up, shall say :

Almighty God, who hath given you a sense of your errors, and a will to do all these things, grant also unto you strength and power to perform the same, that He may accomplish his work which He hath begun in you, through Jesus Christ. *Amen.*"

There are other questions suited to those who renounce their connexion with any other sect, and join the communion of the Anglican Church. Wilkins, iv. 660-662 ; Proceedings of Lower House, Ms. 1713 ; Act-Books of Upper House, 1714, no. 19.

[x] Wilkins, iv. 663-666 ; Act-Books of Upper House, 1714, no. 19.

[y] The Church of England's Wish for restoring of Primitive Discipline considered, in order to its being brought to effect : on which occasion is

great moderation, and the subjects are discussed with much learning. Whoever peruses them with candour will be impressed with a sense of their importance. In both there are allusions to the convocation; and it is clear that the two volumes originated in the discussions which took place in that assembly. The author of the second work observes, "This, therefore, is humbly propounded to the two houses of convocation, that they would begin to answer the great hopes which have been conceived of their perfecting what is wanting to us. The juncture looks favourable, the eyes of the world are upon them, and somewhat is expected proportionable to their own great abilities, and to the encouragement they have from a gracious queen to exert them. Private men may write and wish; but *they* only can (as 'tis fit *they* only *should*) execute."[z]

There is one subject which, though not connected with the convocation, yet, as having been revived during this reign, may require some notice. I allude to the alleged cure of scrofula, or, as it was formerly called, the king's evil, by the royal touch, and to the form republished in the reign of Queen Anne with this title, *At the Healing*. I allude to it especially, because it has sometimes been imagined that the Church had sanctioned the form of prayer, and consequently the practice. A brief sketch of the subject may therefore appropriately be introduced.

The tradition is, that the kings of England and of France were invested with the power of curing this disease by their touch, derived, according to the story, from Edward the Confessor, to whom even the French sovereign was indebted for the privilege. We may deem it very extraordinary that our ancestors entertained such a

shewn the institution, nature, end, and necessity of discipline in the Church of Christ: London, 8vo, 1703. The Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church for the first four hundred years after Christ, together with its declension from the fifth century downwards to its present state, impartially represented; by a Presbyter of the Church of England: London, 8vo, 1714.

[z] Penitential Discipline, p. 5.

notion; yet such was the fact. They believed that the gift was derived from Edward the Confessor, by succession to all our kings and queens. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, William Tooker published a work, which he dedicated to her majesty, as containing an account of the cures which had been effected by the royal touch.[a] Tooker states that he was present for some years whenever the queen touched for the disease; and he gives several stories of persons who, according to his narrative, were completely cured. He relates of one individual that, though a papist, he had still gone to the queen to be touched; and that as he had been perfectly cured, he was convinced by his own experience that the pope's excommunication was of no moment, since no cure could have been effected if she had not been rightful queen.[b]

But the most remarkable volume on this subject was published at the close of the reign of Charles II., by one of the king's surgeons. It consists of three books, with a general title, besides a separate one to each portion of the work. In the first and second books the author treats of the disease medically; and in the third, which is the curious part of the volume, he enters upon the question of the royal touch.[c] Its statements are truly

[a] Charisma, sive Donum Sanationis; seu explicatio totius questionis de mirabilium sanitatum gratia, in qua præcipue agitur de solenni et sacra curatione strumæ, cui reges Angliæ, rite inaugurati divinitus, medicati sunt, et quam serenissima Elizabetha ex cœlesti gratia sibi concessa, applicatione manuum suarum, &c. sanat: auctori Guil. Tookero, S. Theol. Doctore. Londini, 1597, 4to.

[b] Strype's Annals, iv. 438-440.

[c] Charisma Basilicon; or, the Royal Gift of Healing Strumaes, or King's Evil, by contact or imposition of the sacred hands of our Kings of England and of France, given them at their inaugurations. Shewing the gift itself, and its continued use; declaring all persons healed thereby, without any respect either to their age, sex, temper, or constitution; with the manner, form, and ceremonies thereof. The whole concluded with about sixty admirable cures, performed with and without gold, by his Majestie's benediction, by his late Majesty's pretious blood, and the like. Written by John Browne, Chirurgeon in Ordinary to his Majesty. 8vo, London, 1684.

absurd; yet the author details them with all possible gravity, contending that this gift is retained to the Church by means of our kings. In the preface he states that the book had been examined and allowed by his majesty's physician and by the other surgeons of the court. It is written in a most flattering style. Thus he calls Charles "the great parent of our health and safety, who hath as far exceeded his predecessors in this curative faculty as King Edward did his ancestors; who, as he was given to us for our health, and the health of our nation, so in this curative faculty he outshines all the world. And as he takes in him the ruling power by which he governeth by an hereditary right from his royal ancestors, so he continues the same by this balsamick and sanative power, derived to him from his royal forefathers inherent in him."[d] The author must have been a believer in the virtue of the royal touch or a hypocrite, for he says, "Because I have been oft conversant and attending at many of these laudable operations, having waited on his sacred person both at public and private healings as one of his meanest chirurgeons, when I have seen many thousands of poor souls touched and cured by his sacred hand, I am obliged, both by duty and conscience, to give my faith to his royal touch, seeing the daily and unanswerable effects thereof; many of which, as if amazed at the speedy farewell of their diseases, have immediately been cured to admiration, even in the presence, before they have got out of the Banqueting-house at White-hall, where his majesty doth most usually heal." He says that a usurper could not exercise the gift; that Cromwell tried, and failed. Cromwell was too shrewd a man to believe the thing; and if he made the attempt, he must have done so to satisfy others; and it is probable that Charles II., whatever may have been the case with his surgeons, secretly laughed at the folly of the people.

This author gives directions to be observed by those

[d] Charisma Basilicon, 76, 77.

who wish to be admitted to the royal touch. Among other things, they were to bring a certificate from the minister and churchwardens of their parishes that they were never touched before. He even goes so far as to recommend that printed certificates should be sent to the bishops, who should be requested to sign them, and then forward them to their surrogates.[e]

The form used by Charles II. and his predecessors is given by this credulous surgeon, who expatiates largely on his majesty's piety and humility. It is somewhat different from the form used by Queen Anne. The author then gives an account of a large number of persons, as many as sixty, who, he affirms, were cured, some by the application of the blood of Charles I., and the rest by the touch of Charles II. At the close of the volume, a list of the numbers touched every month, from 1660 to 1664, is given from the register kept by the sergeant of the chapel royal. There is also a second list, including the numbers of persons who had been touched from May 1667 to May 1682, from another register. During the year 1682, 8557 persons were touched by his majesty; and the whole number from 1660 was 92,107. According to the author, most of them were perfectly cured. His account of the performance of the ceremony is curious. The patients were placed in order by the yeomen of the guard; after which, on the entrance of the king, the chaplain commenced with the service. At a certain part of the ceremony, the sick persons were presented to his majesty on their knees, who placed his hands on their heads, and then the service was concluded by the chaplain. A portion of gold was given to each person by the king, which may serve as a clue to the whole; for undoubtedly the great majority were attracted by the money more than by the expectation of a cure. The author has also illustrated the matter by a plate, in which his majesty is represented in the act of touching a patient, the chaplains and surgeons

[e] Charisma Basilicon, 85.

being in attendance. The volume is one of the most absurd productions of that or of any other age; and it is difficult to decide whether the author was a believer in the royal touch, or a hypocrite and flatterer.[f]

He was not alone in his belief, however (if a believer at all), for before him Heylin, and subsequently Collier, men who cannot be suspected of hypocrisy, avow their belief in the efficacy of the royal touch. Fuller had expressed a doubt upon the subject; and Heylin, in his animadversions on his *History*, says, "But certainly what effect soever the strength of fancy and an *exalted imagination*, as our author calls it, may produce in those of riper years, it can contribute nothing to the cure of children. And I have seen some children brought before the king by the hanging sleeves, some hanging at their mother's breasts, and others in the arms of their nurses, all touched and cured without the help of any such fancies or imaginations as our author speaks of."[g] Collier, after quoting Heylin, remarks, "Thus we see the kings of England are miraculously distinguished not only from their subjects, but from all the princes of Christendom, excepting those of France, who have a share with them in this extraordinary privilege."[h] Carte was a believer in the virtue of the touch in such cases. He notices the opinion which had been entertained, that the power was communicated to the kings in the anointing at their coronation; but he adds, "I have myself seen a very remarkable instance of such a cure, which could not possibly be ascribed to the regal unction." He then relates a story of a young man, a native of Wells in Somersetshire, who quitted Bristol for Paris in 1717, and was touched by the Pretender. Carte states that the man was cured as soon as he was touched; though he adds that "this descendant and next heir of their blood had not been either crowned or an-

[f] Charisma Basilicon, 132, &c.
[g] Heylin's Examen, 47.
[h] Collier, ii. 226.

ointed."[i] Carte was undoubtedly, as a friend to the exiled family, a willing believer in the efficacy of the touch of the Pretender. Still, that such a man should have been so credulous may well excite our surprise. It appears that the subject was sometimes alluded to even in the pulpit. Thus in a sermon, in 1660, the preacher says, "*Is there no balm in Gilead?* Yes, there is; and therefore let us hope well of the healing of the wounds of the daughter of our people, since they are under the cure of those very hands upon which God hath entailed *a miraculous gift of healing*, as if it were on purpose to raise up our hopes into some confidence, that we shall owe one day to those sacred hands, next under God, the healing of the Church's and the people's evils as well as of the king's."[j]

Various notices occur of Charles II. in connexion with this matter. "July 5, 1660. His majesty began first to *touch for ye evil*, according to custom. His ma^tie sitting under his state in the banquetting-house, the chirurgeons cause the sick to be brought up to the throne, where, they kneeling, y^e king strokes their faces or cheeks with both

[i] Carte's History, i. 291, 292; Whiston's Life, 432-442; Nichols's Literary Anecdotes, ii. 495-504. A correspondence was printed in the General Evening Post, in which Carte states that the note was printed by mistake, but that when printed, he left it in the proof. Whiston had a curious notion. He believes that persons were cured; but he accounts for the cure in another way. He supposes the custom to have been the remains of what he calls the primitive practice of anointing with oil; and then he adds, that the prayers and benedictions were pronounced by the chaplains. Whiston's Life, 442. The sale of Carte's History was greatly damaged by this note.

[j] A Sermon at Westminster at the Consecration of Bishops, by W. S. 4to, 1660, p. 33. The author was no less a person than Sancroft. Aubrey was a firm believer in the efficacy of the touch; and he relates certain instances in his curious work. That he should have believed it, however, will surprise no one, since he appears to have given credit to any thing wonderful. Aubrey's Miscellanies, 130. In a sermon preached before the University of Oxford in 1602, on the 17th of November, the anniversary of the queen's accession, the preacher alludes to the cure of the king's evil by her majesty. Howson's Sermon, &c. &c. 1603, 4to.

his hands at once; at which instant a chaplaine, in his formalities, says, 'He put his hands upon them, and he heeled them.'" Evelyn further describes the putting the piece of gold round the neck of each person. He mentions that the throng of persons for tickets in 1684 was so great that several were pressed to death at the surgeon's door.[k]

James II. repeated the practice. "On Ash-Wednesday the king was pleased to touch, and the chaplains of our religion attended, and read the gospel and prayers, as usually had been done." He did the same at Oxford in 1687. "The next day being Sunday, he went about 9 of the clock into the cathedral, where he touched 700 or 800 people." "Monday, 5th September, about 8 of the clock he went into the cathedral and touched again for the evil."[m] Though the form adopted by Charles II. was used, and the chaplains of the Church of England attended, yet it was evidently James's intention to proceed in this, as in all other matters, as a Romanist. Thus he authorised Hills, his printer, to reprint the form used in the time of Henry VIII. It was probably never used publicly; but his intentions were evident.[n] "This morning the king

[k] Evelyn's Memoirs, ii. 151, 152; Ib. iii. 113.

[l] Patrick's Autobiography, 105.

[m] Life of Anthony Wood, 281, 283.

[n] The Ceremonies for the Healing of them that be diseased with the King's Evil, used in the time of Henry VIII. Published by his majestie's command. London, printed by Henry Hills, printer to the king's most excellent majestie, for his household and chapel, 1686. Mr. Chambers relates that an ancient nonjuror, who was living when his work was published, in the year 1827, told him that an English gentleman applied to George I. for his son; and that on being peevishly told to go to the Pretender, he took the hint, and proceeded to the continent. The old man stated that the youth was cured, and became a convert to the Church of Rome. The young Pretender, the grandson of James II., touched a child in 1745 at Edinburgh, yielding to the persuasions of his friends, for he acted reluctantly. Chambers's History of the Rebellion in Scotland, i. 183, 184. The statement was given to Mr. Chambers by a nonjuror, who professed to have received the account from the individual who had been cured. It was the policy of the Jacobites to foster these notions concerning the Pretender. In 1721 appeared a Letter from a Gentleman at Rome to his Friend

touches in the Ch. Ch. quire." "On Sunday morning the king touched: Warner and White officiating."[o] In some parish registers the certificates of the clergy, that the applicants were not previously touched, still exist.

In the reign of Queen Anne some persons were touched for this disease. The nonjurors asserted, that the virtue or power was in the exiled line; and this circumstance may have led the queen's ministers to countenance the thing; for we can scarcely suppose that they were believers in the efficacy of the royal touch. We know that Dr. Johnson, when a child, was taken to the queen for that purpose.

But the most extraordinary circumstance connected with the subject in this reign was the printing of the office used on such occasions with the Book of Common Prayer. A brief history of the form may be given. The first form on record is that which was used by King Henry VII., in Latin.[p] Henry VIII. used the same form; and it was probably adopted, with some alterations, by Edward VI. Tooker gives an account of the process under Elizabeth, who was accustomed to touch openly at public prayers. "Publicæ igitur concipiuntur preces a ministris regiæ majestatis capellanis, majestate ejus ad illas preces regio cum apparatu procedente, comitantibus nobilibus, stipantibus catervis: ordinariis precibus cum epistolæ et evangelii lectione peractis, sistuntur omnes a chirurgis regiis in præsentia reginæ, ad cujus genua advoluti fide et oratione ferventes opem et auxilium præstolantur. Tum exordiuntur evangelii lectionem ex illo ultimo capite sancti Marci, versu 14." From this passage we ascertain the alterations made in the form of Henry VII. The portions,

in London, giving an account of some very surprising cures in the King's Evil by the touch, lately effected in the neighbourhood of that city. 8vo. This was evidently intended to direct attention to the Pretender.

[o] Letters from the Bodleian, i. 32, 40, 250, 252.

[p] Becket's Inquiry into the Antiquity and Efficacy of touching for the King's Evil, &c. London, 8vo, 1722. Collection of Records, pp. 17-21.

in which the saints and the Virgin Mary were mentioned were expunged. He then gives the form in use in that reign.[q] During this reign the sign of the cross was used; but it was discontinued in that of her successor. Thus a learned ritualist observes, "That wise and learned king, not only (with his son the late king) practically discontinued it, but ordered it to be expunged out of the prayers relating to that cure; which hath proceeded as effectually, that omission notwithstanding, as before."[r] In the reign of Charles I. the service was performed altogether in English, being brought into that shape, which was retained, with slight alterations, in the reigns of Charles II. and Queen Anne.[s]

As this service was destitute of any authority whatever, it is remarkable that it should ever have been printed, not indeed as a part of, but with the Book of Common Prayer; yet such is the fact. It was so printed in the reign of Charles II. and Queen Anne; and in the latter not merely on a separate leaf, but as part of a sheet with the thirty-nine Articles. The Form is found in some copies of the book of 1662. In the reign of Queen Anne it was generally the practice to append the thirty-nine Articles to the Prayer-book, and the form "At the healing" frequently constitutes a portion of the same sheet.[t] But

[q] Tooker's Charisma, &c.

[r] Le Strange's Alliance, &c. 240.

[s] Becket's Inquiry, &c. 22-24. Kennet states that the form was altered by James. He must, however, allude to the form which he procured to be printed, not the form actually used. Nichols says the form was first printed in a sheet, then in additions to Le Strange; and he states that, though he had searched many editions of the Book of Common Prayer, he had not found it before the reign of Queen Anne. Nichols, ii. 501; Kennet's Register, 731. Aubrey says: "Whether our kings were of the house of York or Lancaster, it did the cure, *i.e.* for the most part. 'Tis true indeed at the touching there are prayers read, but perhaps neither the king attends them nor his chaplains." He adds: "In Somersetshire 'tis confidently reported that some were cured of the king's evil by the touch of the Duke of Monmouth." Miscellanies, 130.

[t] It is found in a book, as I have previously mentioned, of 1661. Copies

what is still more remarkable, in an edition of the Common Prayer in 1715, the first year of George I., this *form for the healing* is also printed on the same page with the commencement of the thirty-nine Articles. Whether it is found in books later in that reign I cannot determine. Probably it was retained at first simply on the authority of the printer, who followed the books of Queen Anne, no order being given to discontinue the practice.

The form, however, is altogether unauthorised; and the wonder is, that it was ever appended to the Prayer-book. The subject was never discussed in convocation; so that we may infer that the clergy were not believers in the tradition respecting the royal touch. Nor was it authorised formally by the queen in council. It must, therefore, have been surreptitiously introduced, for some reason or other, by those to whom was entrusted the superintendence of the printing-office in the reign of Queen Anne. It is evident, that the *touching* was revived in order to create the belief that Queen Anne was entitled to the crown by descent, according to the tradition that the gift descended on all the sovereigns from Edward the Confessor. Thus it was noticed in the newspapers: "Yesterday the queen was most graciously pleased to touch for the king's evil." So on her visit to Bath, several were touched in private, because it could not conveniently be done in public. "To make the thing more serious," says

with the form are, I believe, rare; but the circumstance shews that the king soon commenced the practice of touching. I have a large-paper copy of the book of 1661, and also a large-paper copy of the edition of 1662, with this unauthorised form, which follows the sheet that contains several portions of the commination-service. I have various editions of Queen Anne's reign containing the form, the earliest being a large folio of the year 1703. Miss Strickland has fallen into the strange error of supposing that the "healing" form was a part of the Book of Common Prayer in the time of Queen Anne. She appears to connect this form in some way with that for the queen's accession, with which it had nothing whatever to do. Strickland's Lives, xii. 108-110.

Tindal, "an office is inserted in the Liturgy, to be used on this occasion."[u]

The old form commenced with the gospel for Ascension-day, Mark xvi. verse 14. The words, "They shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover," were repeated with each individual. Then a second gospel was read from the first of John; and at the words, "That light was the true light," &c., the king put the gold about the necks of the patients, the words being repeated in every case. Certain versicles were then used, and also the Lord's prayer; after which other versicles with responses to be used by the sick followed. So far all the copies of the ancient form, as far as I have examined them, agree; but at this point, namely, the concluding prayer, there is a difference. Our author, Browne, gives one form, and Heylin gives another, though both are to the same effect.[v]

[u] Tindal's Cont. iii. 592. Here Tindal is altogether mistaken, as he is in many other things; for the office is not inserted in the Liturgy. Whiston states a rumour that King William "was prevailed upon once to touch for the king's evil, *praying God to heal the patient, and grant him more wisdom at the same time*, which implied that he had no great faith in the operation. Yet was the patient cured notwithstanding." Life of Whiston, 653. So strong a believer was Whiston in the anointing with oil, that he gives several cases of alleged cures among a small body of Baptists, by whom it was practised in his day. Ib. 448-454, 653-658.

[v] Heylin's Examen, 48, 49; Collier, ii. 226, who copies it from Heylin; Browne's Charisma Basilicon. 99, 100; Sparrow's Collections; Wilkins, iv. 476, 477. In the time of Queen Anne an alteration was made, but by whom it is not easy to ascertain. The form, as it stands in the Prayer-books in her reign is as follows:

"AT THE HEALING.

Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings, &c.

The Gospel, Mark xvi. ver. 14.

Let us pray.

Lord have mercy upon us.

Christ have mercy upon us.

Lord have mercy upon us.

Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.

Then shall the infirm persons, one by one, be presented to the queen upon their knees, and as every one is presented, and while the queen is laying her hands upon

I have introduced the subject in this chapter for two reasons: first, as a matter of curious inquiry; and secondly and especially, for the purpose of shewing that the Church is in no way responsible either for the service in question, or for the practice. Though printed with the Book of Common Prayer, yet the form was of no authority whatever. It has sometimes been adduced as an evidence of superstitious practice on the part of the Church of England in a former period; but from the foregoing remarks it will be seen, that whatever may have been the case with individuals, the Church never gave her sanction to any custom to which the charge could be properly applied.

---

them, and putting the gold about their necks, the chaplain that officiates, turning himself to her majesty, shall say these words following:

God give a blessing to this work; and grant that *these* sick *persons* on whom the queen *lays* her hands, may recover, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

After all have been presented, the chaplain shall say,

Vers. O Lord, save thy servants,

These answers are to be made by them that come to be healed.

Resp. *Who put their trust in thee.*
Vers. Send them help from thy holy place.
Resp. *And evermore mightily defend them.*
Vers. Help us, O God of our salvation.

Resp. *And for the glory of thy name, deliver us, and be merciful unto us, sinners, for thy name's sake.*

Vers. O Lord, hear our prayers.

Resp. *And let our cry come unto thee.*

Let us pray.

O Almighty God, who art the giver of all health, and the aid of them that seek to thee for succour, we call upon thee for thy help and goodness mercifully to be shewed upon these thy servants, that they being healed of their infirmities, may give thanks unto thee in thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Then the chaplain, standing with his face towards them that come to be healed, shall say,

The Almighty Lord, who is a most strong, &c. (*From the Visitation of the Sick.*)

The grace of our Lord, &c."

It will be seen that this form varies from the older service. Its rubrical directions are more explicit, and it assumes a more complete shape; so that some pains must have been bestowed upon it in the reign of Queen Anne before it was printed.

CHAPTER XIV.

A.D. 1714—1741.

George I. — Convocation assembles — License for business — Form for consecrating churches — Various forms — Consecration of communion-plate — Convocation adjourned — Meet in 1717 — Hoadly's Preservative and Sermon — Considered in convocation — Representation of lower house — Prorogation — Bangorian controversy — Works — Controversies arising out of the main one — Kennet's with Nicholson — Subsequent proceedings — Suspension of synodical business — The President's right — The royal license.

Queen Anne was succeeded by the Elector of Hanover, George I., according to the terms of the Act of Settlement; and the first parliament and convocation of the new reign were assembled in March 1715. Both houses concurred in an address to his majesty, which was presented on the 7th of April. The king assured them that he should always support the Church of England, and further, that it would be his especial aim to encourage the clergy. The usual sermon at the commencement of this convocation was preached by Gibson, subsequently Bishop of London. It was printed in 1717, with his *Tracts on Visitations*. In the same volume is another tract, which was drawn up by Gibson, and probably read in convocation, on the same subject as the sermon, namely excommunication.[a]

On the 5th of May the king's letter or license, authorising the convocation to proceed to business, was communicated to the houses, containing the following heads of business.

The regulating proceedings in excommunications and commutation of penances.

[a] Gibson's Tracts. Before the meeting of convocation the king issued directions to the bishops relative to unity and the doctrine of the Trinity. Wilkins, iv. 666, 667.

The making provision for preserving terriers and accounts of glebes and tithes.

The regulation of marriage-licenses, with a view to the prevention of clandestine marriages.

The preparation of a form for the consecration of churches and chapels.

The settling the qualifications, titles, and testimonials of candidates for orders.

The making the 75th canon, relating to sober conversation in ministers; the 47th canon, relative to curates; and the 48th, touching licenses, more effectual.

Rules for the better instruction of youth for confirmation.

The bishops undertook to prepare the matters relative to marriage, the consecration of churches, candidates for orders, and confirmation, the others being left to the lower house. Both houses proceeded with their labours, and some progress was made, when their proceedings were interrupted by the case of Hoadly, which issued, as will be seen, in a determination on the part of the crown not to permit the convocation to transact synodical business. In the month of August a book was examined by the lower house, on *The Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures*, which was censured as treating of sacred things in a profane manner. The bishops promised to take the subject into their consideration; but this, like all other matters, was prevented by the controversy which followed.[b]

In the month of July the bishops had prepared the *Form of consecrating churches, chapels, churchyards, or places of burial.* A form had been drawn up in 1712 by order of Queen Anne, but the business was commenced afresh in this convocation. In a letter, dated June 21,

[b] Act-Books, Upper House, 1715; Wilkins, iv. 668. It was written by Hare, subsequently Bishop of Chichester. It was also censured for reflecting upon the Fathers, and for insinuating that the Articles were not grounded on Scripture. Whiston's Life of Clarke, &c., 167.

1712, Tenison writes that he had received the form, and subscribed it, adding, that before his name he had left a space, that the following words, if judged expedient, might be introduced: "This form of consecrating, &c., hath passed both houses of convocation, and so is approved."[c] It is said that this form of 1712 was subscribed by both houses, and approved by her majesty; but in all probability the matter was not fully settled, otherwise the business would not have been recommenced at this time. The form of 1714 was approved by the bishops, and certain amendments were proposed by the lower house; but this also was prevented from being completed by the proceedings respecting Hoadly.[d]

The two forms, that of 1712 and that of 1714, are substantially the same, though in some few points they differ from each other. It is, however, evident that the service of 1714 is only a revision of that of 1712. Still we have no duly authorised form for the consecration of churches, and our bishops are left to the exercise of their own judgments. They may adopt either of the above-mentioned forms, or they may prepare a special one for any occasion that may arise. At the Reformation, when our various services were compiled, churches were not wanted, or the Reformers would undoubtedly have prepared a form for their consecration. At length, when new churches were erected, the want was felt. Bishop Andrews was the first to prepare a regular form for the purpose. It was used by himself and some other bishops, and also by Archbishop Laud, with a few alterations, at the consecration of the church of St. Catherine Cree, which was not forgotten at his trial.

[c] Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 819.

[d] Proceedings of Convocation, Ms. 1715, Lower House; Act-Books, Upper House, 1715. The various alterations proposed and carried in convocation in this form exist, and are preserved in these Ms. books. The Ms. form used by Tenison in consecrating the new churchyard at Lambeth in 1705 is preserved among the Lambeth Mss., and another form used for Bromley College. Gibson Mss. vol. i. 82-97.

Before the time of Bishop Andrews, it appears that the bishops were accustomed to compose a particular form whenever a church was to be consecrated. King, Bishop of London, composed a prayer, which he used in 1615 at the consecration of a chapel at Edmington; and the same form was used in 1616 by the Bishop of Chester, in the parish of Barking, in Essex.[e]

Some steps were taken towards the preparation of a form by the convocation in 1662, though nothing was finished. In 1704, the chapel of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, was consecrated by Patrick, Bishop of Ely, who used a form somewhat different from that of Bishop Andrews. It was evidently drawn up by himself; for it was printed at the end of the sermon which was preached on the occasion, and published by the bishop's permission. No man was better qualified for such a work than Patrick. In this service is a prayer which Patrick used in the consecration of the communion-plate:

"Most blessed God, accept, we beseech thee, of the oblation we make unto thee of these vessels, which we

[e] Collier, ii. 709. In 1616 Archbishop Abbot consecrated the chapel at Dulwich, using a form which is preserved in the Register. This was the chapel of the College erected by Alleyn. Abbot acted during the vacancy of the see of Winchester, Bishop Bilson dying in June that year, and Montague not being appointed until 1617. The chapel and college were commenced in 1614, and finished in 1616, as is proved by the consecration, though it is stated in the Biog. Brit. that the building was finished about 1617. This year is fixed upon, because Alleyn's diary of accounts begins in September of that date. Biog. Brit. art. Alleyn. "I must confess that there occurs no form in our English liturgies: those times were more inclinable to the pulling down of old churches than building of new. But when the times were better settled, and that new churches began to be erected, and the old ones to be repaired, some bishops made a form of consecrating to be used by themselves on such occasions; and others followed a form composed by Bishop Andrews, a man as much averse as any from the corruptions and superstitions of the Church of Rome. A canon had been passed for digesting an uniform order of such consecrations, as there was made a body of Visitation Articles for the public use of all that exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which every bishop and archdeacon had before fashioned for themselves." Heylin's Laud, 12, 13.

humbly dedicate to thy divine service at thy holy table; and as we now wholly give them up to thy use in the ministration of the holy communion of Christ's body and blood, so we pray thee to receive them for thine own; preserve them from being any way profaned: and being here set apart and consecrated by our office and ministry to thy service, let them always continue to be so employed, through Jesus Christ our only Lord and Saviour. Amen."[f]

Archbishop Sancroft, at the request of Kettlewell, consecrated some communion-plate, in the reign of James II., for the church of Coleshill, of which the latter was vicar.[g]

It would seem that the convocation were led to the subject by the parliamentary grant for the erection of fifty new churches in London and its vicinity, some of which were nearly ready for consecration. Probably the new churches were consecrated according to this form; yet neither this nor that of 1714 possesses any authority. The form of 1712 was, I believe, first printed by Lewis in his work on the consecration of churches.[h]

[f] A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Chapel of St. Katherine's Hall, in the University of Cambridge, September 1, 1704, by John Long, B.D. and Fellow of the said Hall; to which is added, the Form of Consecration used by the Lord Bishop of Ely: Cambridge, 4to, 1704. Patrick's Autobiography, 187.

[g] Kettlewell's Life, 137, 138. In 1703 Tisdale published a form for the consecration of churches, which he dedicated to the archbishops and bishops. He also gives the form for the consecration of communion-plate, which was used by Sancroft in Kettlewell's church. Tisdale's form differs materially from that of 1712. The Form of Dedication and Consecration of a Church or Chapel, &c., London, printed for John Hartley, in Holborn, 1703, 4to.

[h] An historical Essay upon the Consecration of Churches; with an account of the form and ceremonies of consecrations among the Jews, Heathens, and Christians; describing the magnificent feasts and entertainments upon those joyful occasions; and proving the antiquity of those anniversary festivals called wakes, observed in country villages in memory of the consecration of their particular churches. To which is added a Form of consecrating churches, chapels, and churchyards, passed in the Lower House of Convocation, 1712, with a design to have it established among the offices of the liturgy, and compiled chiefly for the consecration of the new churches. Copied from the

In the year 1712 an attempt was made to stir up the feelings of the people against the Church, quite equal to some of the proceedings of the days of the Long Parliament, which proved that the enemies of the clergy only wanted the power to pursue a similar course with the persecutors of the previous century. The circumstances are curious, and give a singular illustration of the tactics adopted by the men who were opposed to the Church; and base as was the conduct of the Long Parliament and its instruments in 1643, that of some persons in 1712, as will be seen from the ensuing statement, would not have been less so, had they possessed the same power as their unprincipled predecessors.

It will be remembered that soon after the meeting of the Long Parliament many clergymen were ejected from their livings under the pretence of being scandalous ministers. The ordinance of sequestration called them *scandalous, insufficient,* and *malignant;* though they were in reality ejected merely for *malignancy,* by which was intended not assisting the parliament against the king. Unless they lent their aid to the parliament, the charge of *malignancy* was alleged, and ejection followed. Numbers were removed under this false charge; though, to give a colour to their proceedings, the parliamentary commissioners usually joined some other charges with the principal one, wishing it to be understood that the ministers were removed for errors in doctrine, or immorality in conduct.

journal of the House, and never before made public. London, 1719. This form was confirmed by the lower house, if not by both. The forms are preserved in the books of the two houses. There are copies in the Wake Mss. at Oxford. It may be observed, that many of the papers in the Wake collection of Mss. are copies from the books in London. The following curious entry occurs in one of the volumes at Christ Church: "Received of Dr. White Kennet the sum of two guineas for transcribing above forty sheets. Nov. 20, 1713. E. Lanbridge." The form is written by Kennet, and signed by Lanbridge. Never was our uniformity in this respect more required to be settled than at the present time, when so many new churches are erected.

To justify the parliament in its most iniquitous course, *The First Century of scandalous Ministers*, one of the most disgraceful productions of those sad times, was published. It was disgraceful, because it put forth a falsehood on its title-page, asserting that the clergy were expelled for being scandalous in their conduct and immoral in their lives; whereas *opposition* to the parliament, which was called malignancy, was their only crime. This is evident from the document itself; for after an enumeration of charges relative to the ceremonies and sermons, *opposition to the parliament* generally closes the catalogue. This shameful tract was published by the authority of parliament. The *epistle to the reader* states, that it was intended to satisfy the public that the parliament had good reason "to resolve that the present Church government by archbishops, bishops, &c., is evill and justly offensive, &c. &c., and therefore to be taken away." Thus the book was got up to prepare the way for the removal of episcopacy. The reader is told in the preface that the clergy who opposed the parliament could not "endure the purity, power, and strictnesse of the true religion." To meet the argument derived from their learning, it proceeds, "and let not the learning of some few of these men (for which, if they had grace to use it well, they were considerable) move thee to thinke they be hardly dealt with, for learning in a man unsanctified is but a pearle in a swine's snout." Opposition to the parliament was a mark of an unsanctified state with these pretenders to sanctity. The book proves the difficulty of the sequestrators in making out their cases; for some of their charges are simply ridiculous, such as neglecting "the monthly fast, setting their men to plow," and "great malignity to the parliament."[1] Indeed these men could not have taken

[1] The First Century of scandalous, malignant Priests, made and admitted into Benefices by the Prelates in whose hands the Ordination of Ministers and Government of the Church hath been; or, a Narration of the causes for which the Parliament hath ordered the sequestration of the benefices of se-

a more effectual way to condemn themselves with posterity than the publication of this book, for it is its own refutation from its inconsistencies and absurdities. Fuller remarks, "some were merely outed for their affection to the king's cause; and what was malignity at London was loyalty at Oxford."[j]

In so large a body there were probably some men of immoral character; but the majority were guilty only of *malignancy*. The immoral men would have been so destitute of principle that they would have submitted to the parliament. The fact that some few may have been immoral does not wipe off the foul stain from the parliament, of charging all who were ejected as scandalous ministers. In general, the accusers of the clergy were their parishioners, whose object was to avoid paying their tithes. All persons were invited by the parliament to come forward and adduce charges against their ministers. "The manner was to lay all manner of crimes in the petition and articles; and if any of the least, or which they called so, such as bowing at the name of Jesus, preaching against sacrilege, or for conformity, were proved, the charge was supposed sufficiently made good, and they were treated accordingly, as if they had been the most notorious offenders."[k]

In the year 1702 Calamy published his account of the ministers ejected under the Act of Uniformity in 1662. To this course no reasonable objection could be raised; but in the year 1712 proposals were issued for putting forth an account of the clergy who had been unwarrantably ejected between the year 1640 and 1662. Calamy's sufferers were, in many cases, removed from livings to which they had no claim; while the episcopal clergy had

verall ministers complained of before them, for vitiousnesse of life, errors in doctrine contrary to the Articles of our religion, and for practising and pressing superstitious innovations against law, and for malignancy against the Parliament. London, 1643, 4to.

[j] Fuller, b. xi. 207.

[k] Nalson's Collections, ii. 238.

been sequestered for no crime. Walker therefore published his proposals for printing an account of the numbers of the episcopal clergy. Nor was it to be imagined, after Calamy's attempt, that the clergy would sit still. Yet this reasonable course awakened the fears of some of the enemies of the Church, who well knew how the tale would tell against the nonconformists; and to bring odium on Walker's attempt, the *Infamous Century* was reprinted, but with certain alterations and suppressions in the title and in the work, which evince in the clearest way the unmitigated hatred of the party towards the Church of England.[1]

The alterations in the title and the suppressions in the book will strike the reader at first sight. Various crimes are specified which do not appear in the title of the original work. The omission of the chief charge of *malignancy against the parliament* is remarkable, which is also omitted in the body of the work; so that the reader who was unacquainted with the original would not have supposed that such an allegation existed. Yet *malignancy* was the key to the whole. The other charges were false; this only was true. The former were added to lead the people to believe that the clergy were immoral; the latter was the sole cause of their ejection. They were, in short, removed under a false pretence. Yet the malignancy of the persons who put forth this book in 1712 was greater than that which was manifested by the Long Parliament. The latter mentioned malignancy, which was the real crime; the former omit it altogether, to induce the belief that the charges which they enumerate were true. In the preface

[1] A New Year's Gift for the High-Church Clergy; being an account of the Sufferings of a great number of the Clergy of the Church of England, who were sequestered, harassed, and persecuted by the Parliament in the late times of the Great Rebellion, for errors in doctrine and vitiousness of life, viz. Armenianism, atheism, and deism, drunkenness, wh——, swearing, cursing, blasphemy, and s——. First printed by order of parliament in the year 1643, and now reprinted in the year 1712, for reasons shewed in the preface. 8vo.

to the latter book, the writer asserts that some of the clergy who were removed "merited a gibbet;" and after alluding to Walker's attempt, he asserts: "we are ready to furnish out a fresh collection of living nuysances, that are not only a reproach to the Christian religion, but a scandal to morality." The work was privately printed, or probably the publisher would have been prosecuted. A more wicked performance was never put forth. The threat in the sentence just quoted was never attempted to be put in execution; but it proves incontestably that some parties at this period would have persecuted the members of the Church of England with as much violence as was exhibited by the Long Parliament.

In the lower house a declaration was agreed upon "to make the 75th canon more effectual." Both houses also concurred in an address to the king, thanking his majesty for the provision which he had made for maintaining the ministers of the fifty new churches. The convocation was adjourned in September, and did not meet for business until January 1716. Tenison's death interrupted the proceedings; and after Wake's appointment to the vacant see of Canterbury, another warrant for business was issued on the 28th of April.[m]

Richardson charges Tenison with negligence in not consecrating bishops for the continent; but the charge is unsupported by the fact. The learned Grabe, who became a clergyman of the Church of England, was exceedingly anxious that the plan for sending bishops to the continental churches should be carried out; and various schemes were proposed for the accomplishment of the object. Richardson published his edition of Godwin under the auspices of Archbishop Potter. He had written severely about Tenison in this matter of the foreign consecrations; but Potter prevailed upon him to cancel the sheet containing the obnoxious reflections; and Tenison

[m] Wilkins, iv. 668-670.

is only charged with negligence in the business. Even this charge is destitute of foundation; for one of the alleged grounds on which it is based, namely, a certain letter from Germany, is positively denied by the archbishop. In short, he never received such a letter. This circumstance was known to Potter, and led him to procure the cancelling of the sheet in Richardson's work. A similar project for the continent was entertained under Archbishop Wake, and with no better success. Further, the archbishop was charged with obstructing the business of convocation, and with declining to send bishops to our American colonies. But here, again, he is less to be blamed than some persons imagine. With respect to the former part of the charge, it may be replied that the minister of the crown usually decided whether the convocation should meet for business; and his codicil to his will disproves the latter. He leaves one thousand pounds to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for the endowment of two bishops in America; and the terms in which the bequest is made prove his anxiety on the subject. "Until such lawful appointment and consecrations are completed, I am very sensible (as many of my brethren of that society also are) that, as there has not hitherto been, notwithstanding much importunity and many promises to the contrary, so there never will or can be any regular church-discipline in those parts, or any confirmations, or due ordinations, or any setting apart in ecclesiastical manner of any public places for the more decent worship of God; or any timely preventing or abating of factions or divisions, which have been, and are at present very rife; no ecclesiastically legal discipline or corrections of scandalous manners either in the clergy or laity; or synodical assemblies as may be a proper means to regulate ecclesiastical proceedings." This passage proves that Tenison was neither indifferent about episcopacy in America nor convocations at home. The charge, which has often been repeated, was utterly unfounded; and it

is deeply to be regretted that the memory of an archbishop should be loaded with such an imputation.[n]

We proceed, therefore, to the year 1717, the year so memorable in the history of English convocations, since the controversy now originated which led the government to put an end to all synodical business. From that time no license or warrant to proceed to synodical acts has been granted. The causes of that determination on the part of the government are now to be detailed.

In the year 1716, when some of the clergy and laity were averse to the existing government, wishing for the restoration of the exiled line, Hoadly, who, since his former controversy, had been raised to the episcopal bench, published *A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors both in Church and State; or an Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sense of the Christian Laity.* The commencement of the work partly explains the writer's object, and the cause which induced him to enter upon a course which would necessarily expose him to attack.

"After near thirty years of such patience and indul-

[n] Tenison's Life, 128, 129; Godwin de Præsul. 167; Biog. Brit., arts.; Tenison, Wake, Grabe. Men on both sides in the controversies of those days were often misrepresented by their opponents. Dodwell may be mentioned as an instance on the opposite part. In 1691 it was reported that he was about to publish a work in defence of the deprived bishops, on principles which would overturn the Reformation. The rumour is mentioned in a letter by Whitby, who says that he had heard that Dodwell acknowledged that "the reformers were formal schismatics in departing from Rome." Dodwell replies: "My opinions as to the Papists are y^e^ same now as when I was with you in Salisbury; and I am now as far as I was then from charging our first reformers with either heresy or schism." He then mentions that it was only an inference of Hody's. In the next place follows a letter from Hody, stating that he had been reported to have said at Burnet's table that "you are the pest of the nation, or the most pestilential fellow of the University," or some such like words. Hody indignantly denies the charge. To this letter Dodwell writes a long answer, in which he says that the words were Burnet's own, uttered in consequence of Hody's account of what he intended to say in his answer to the Ms. published by the latter. This correspondence is preserved in the Tanner Mss. vol. 459.

gence as was never yet experienced in any nation of the world by the public and avowed enemies of its government, the nonjurors now at length think it time to open the scene, for which they have been long preparing the way, in a more covered and private manner. Whether they imagine that all the lenity with which they have hitherto been treated hath been nothing else but fear and a consciousness of wrong, or that their own cause is for ever lost, if this crisis of time be not laid hold on; whatever it be, the establishment is now openly and directly charged with the want of all right. Their cause is now publicly declared to be the cause of God. The Church is made a principal part of the argument. The words *unity*, *schism*, *altar*, *excommunication*, *damnation*, and the like, are thrown about in such a manner as to confound the understanding of honest men of low capacities. In these circumstances I have a mind, as far as I am able, to point out to you the true way of judging of what they are now perpetually offering to you upon these heads."

Hoadly proceeds to state what he considers the foundation of the difference between the two parties. "The foundation of our difference is this: In the year 1688 the nation, the whole nation of Protestants, universally and equally, felt and saw themselves on the brink of destruction. The chief men among us invited over the assistance of our neighbours. After having warded off the present threatening ruin, nothing remained but to secure us from the return of the same evils of popery and slavery, made more terrible by the revenge which must then have come along with them. This was done with the greatest regard to the constitution of the kingdom, and with the least deviation from the common rule. The popish branches of the royal family were set aside upon no other consideration than the safety of the whole nation. And the very first Protestant branches in the same royal family were declared heirs; and the succession from them

declared and confirmed, in the same course as was usual before."[o]

To this passage most men will cordially subscribe. He goes on to say:

"Upon the first settlement of the nation some of the bishops, and some also of the inferior clergy, refusing to give the common security of faithfulness and allegiance to the government, and declaring themselves in the interest of its enemies, were first *suspended*, and then, after a delay of six months, *deprived*. From hence arose these two main principles, that our princes upon this Protestant establishment, in exclusion to the popish line, can have no right to the crown; and the other, that no deprivation of bishops by the lay power can be valid, or ought to be submitted to. And from these two principles arose two points of practice; the one, the adhering to the popish line; and the other, the adhering to the communion of the deprived bishops, and the treating of our churches as no churches."[p]

Hoadly then remarks that the nonjurors did not disclose their real sentiments at first, because there was the expectation of seeing the restoration of King James by means of the power of France. He therefore set himself to oppose the nonjurors, and to defend the Revolution settlement.

On the 31st of March, in the ensuing year 1717, the Bishop of Bangor preached a sermon before his majesty, in the Chapel Royal at St. James's, on John xviii. 36: "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world." This *Sermon* and the *Preservative*, both being framed on the same principles, were very obnoxious to many of the clergy, even to those who were well affected to the settlement of the crown in the Protestant line. The question was discussed, therefore, in the lower house of convocation; and a committee, consisting of Mosse, Sherlock,

[o] Hoadly's Preservative, p. 6. [p] Ibid. p. 7.

Cannon, Davies, Friend, Bisse, Dawson, Spratt, and Barrell, was appointed to draw up a report on the subject. They entered upon their task on the 3d of May, and on the 10th the report was submitted to the house. It was addressed to the archbishop and bishops as the *Representation* of the lower house; and it stated that the Bishop of Bangor had given grievous offence by advancing certain doctrines and positions in the works to which allusion has already been made. The lower house state that the tendency of the two works is conceived to be,

"First, to subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, and to reduce his kingdom to a state of anarchy and confusion.

"Secondly, to impugn and impeach the regal supremacy in cases ecclesiastical, and the authority of the legislature to enforce obedience in matters of religion by civil sanction."[q]

Passages from the Preservative and the Sermon were adduced in proof of these two positions, and the archbishop and bishops were requested to interpose. At this stage of the business, before it was even presented, the government deemed it necessary to interfere; and before any progress could be made, the convocation was prorogued until the 22d of the ensuing November; so that as far as the two houses were concerned, the matter was now concluded.

Such, however, was not the case out of doors. The Preservative, the Sermon, and the Report of the lower house were extensively circulated throughout the kingdom, almost all the clergy taking one side or other in the

[q] A Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, appointed to draw up a Representation to be laid before the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, concerning several dangerous positions and doctrines contained in the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative, and his Sermon preached March 31st, 1717; read in the Lower House May 10th, 1717, and voted, *nemine contradicente*, to be received and entered upon the books of the said House: London, 1717. Wilkins, iv. 672-676.

controversy. Editions were multiplied to an unusual extent. The first person who took the field in opposition to Hoadly was Dr. Snape, whose Letter, occasioned by the Sermon, appears to have been as widely circulated as the preceding works.

It was immediately reported that Hoadly had solicited the government to interpose by a prorogation, in order that the inquiry might be stopped. To this report the bishop gave the most unqualified denial.

"As soon as I heard of the intention of some in the lower house, I had no other thought, desire, or resolution, but to answer in my place before the same house to which this accusation was designed to be brought; and before those worthy prelates to whom the appeal was to be made. But it was thought proper to put a stop to the sitting of the convocation; which (because it has been unkindly and industriously represented as the effect of my solicitation, and an argument of my fear, and what I fled to for refuge, I am obliged to declare before the world) was done, not only without my feeling, but without so much as my knowledge, or even suspicion of any such design, till it was actually resolved and ordered."[r]

In this preface the bishop states that the Representation was not confirmed by the lower house. "The reader is desired to observe, that the Representation, to which the following book is an answer, was drawn up by a committee of the lower house of convocation; and never approved of by the lower house, so as to be made the act of it; though many have been led to think it was, by the low artifice made use of in the title-page to the printed copy of it."[s]

There is, however, reason to believe that the title states only the truth, namely, that it was read and ordered

[r] An Answer to the Representation drawn up by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, concerning several dangerous positions and doctrines contained in the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative and Sermon, by Benjamin Lord Bishop of Bangor, pref. 4, 5.

[s] Ib. p. 3; Proceedings of Convocation, Ms. Lower House, 1717.

to be entered on the books; so that the Representation must be regarded as the act of the whole house, and not merely of the committee, as the bishop insinuates. It must be evident that the majority would have concurred in that Representation; and had not the government been fearful of such a result, it was not probable that they would have interposed by a prorogation. It was resolved at all hazards to protect the bishop from the censure of the lower house.

The interruption of the business in the convocation was the signal for war through the medium of the press. The controversy is now known as the Bangorian controversy. Many pamphlets and volumes appeared in rapid succession, until the combatants, wearied with the strife, ceased to engage in the contest, or were laid in the silent grave. Snape, Sherlock, Law, and Cannon were the bishop's principal opponents, though several other individuals took part in the controversy; on the other side were Hoadly himself, Sykes, and Whitby, with others of less note. By the former, the views of the Representation were defended; by the latter, the bishop's positions were asserted and maintained.

Sherlock, as has been mentioned, was one of the committee of convocation. On the 5th of November, in 1712, Sherlock had preached a sermon before the Lord Mayor at St. Paul's Church, in which certain positions were advanced, which, it was alleged, were exactly similar to those which had been condemned from the Bishop of Bangor's books. The Bangorian controversy took a new turn; for Sherlock was attacked for inconsistency, in now condemning as false what he had advanced as true in 1712. Of the large mass of pamphlets on the Bangorian controversy, several relate to this branch of the dispute.[t]

[t] A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Sherlock, one of the Committee of Convocation, &c., comparing the dangerous positions and doctrines contained in the Doctor's Sermon preached November 5, 1712, with those charged upon the Bishop in the late Report of the Committee, 1717, 8vo. This was written by Sykes, who wittily placed upon his title-page the following texts: "That

Sykes remarks, that Sherlock had taken so active a part in the convocation, that an examination of his conduct was excusable, adding, "If my lord bishop be guilty of what you have charged him with, the Dean of Chichester is guilty of the same crime."[u] He then proceeds to an examination of Sherlock's sermon, placing certain passages in juxta-position with some of those selected for censure by the committee of the lower house from Hoadly's Preservative and Sermon, for the purpose of shewing that the views of the bishop and the dean are identical. In my opinion, Sykes succeeded in proving the inconsistency of Sherlock, for I cannot perceive any difference between the views of the sermon on the 5th of November and those of the Bishop of Bangor. Sherlock published a reply, in which he endeavoured to shew that his views, as expressed in the sermon, were not identical with those which he had joined in condemning. Sykes replied in a second letter, in which he reiterated the charge. It will, I think, be difficult to discover any difference in the following passages, which I give merely as a sample.

The Report, p. 10. *From Hoadly.*	Sherlock's Sermon, page 8.
"If any men upon earth have a right to add to the sanctions of his (Christ's) laws, that is, to increase the number or alter the nature of the rewards and punishments of his subjects in matters of conscience and salvation, they are so far kings in his stead, and reign in their own kingdom, and not in his."	"'Tis just reasoning to infer from the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, and the spiritual power of his ministers on earth, that temporal punishments are not proper to enforce the laws and edicts of Christ's kingdom; for since the kingdom is not of this world, the powers belonging to this kingdom cannot be of this world."

The controversy was conducted with great bitterness of spirit, and with much asperity of language. So strongly did the government feel on the subject, that the names of

which I do, I allow not" (Rom. vii. 15); and "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth" (Rom. xiv. 22).

[u] A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Sherlock, &c. p. 6.

Snape and Sherlock, the two most violent of Hoadly's opponents, were struck from the list of royal chaplains.[v]

Besides the main points in the controversy, it also branched out into others of a personal character, so that on some occasions the original dispute appeared to be forgotten in individual quarrels. One of these was of a very painful kind. In his second letter, Dr. Snape asks, whether Hoadly had not submitted his sermon to an individual before it was preached, and whether it had not been altered, at that individual's suggestion, by the insertion of certain qualifying expressions by way of caution. The bishop denied that such was the case. He had previously stated, in his reply to Snape's first letter, that the sermon had been preached without the knowledge of any living man. In his second letter, therefore, Snape quitted the argument, and attacked the bishop on this point, alleging that if Hoadly replied in the negative, he would produce a person, as high in station as his lordship, who would prove the affirmative. Hoadly immediately printed a letter in the *Daily Courant*, solemnly denying the charge. When challenged by the bishop, Snape, in an advertisement in the *Post-Boy*, mentioned the name of Dr. Hutchinson, who had heard it from the Bishop of Carlisle. The bishop, according to Hutchinson, had said that he had conversed with the individual to whom the Bishop of Bangor had submitted his sermon, and who had recommended the insertion of such qualifying words as *properly* and *absolutely*. Hoadly then called upon the Bishop of Carlisle to make good his assertions. At first the Bishop of Carlisle argued with Snape, that he had not said that the words were in-

[v] Whiston's account of Hoadly is by no means flattering. "He was a much better man before he was a bishop. For six years he never saw his diocese, but was employed in controversy. It came to no other issue than to make wise men sensible that they had run into great extremes, while neither side would recede from their own imaginations." Whiston's Life, 244, 313. Hoadly was the reputed author of the Account of Religion in England to the Pope, under the name of Sir Richard Steele. Biog. Brit.

serted before the sermon was preached, but before the publication; and he acknowledged that he was acquainted with a person who had put forth that statement. On being pressed to mention the name of the person, he gave that of Dr. White Kennet, who positively denied that he had ever stated that the sermon was submitted to his inspection, or altered at his suggestion.[w] The Bishop of Carlisle, however, asserted publicly, through the press, that Dr. Kennet had actually assured him that the words were inserted by his advice. He allowed Snape to publish a passage, adding that it was *true*.

Being marked out in such a singular manner, Kennet published an advertisement, dated July 6th, 1717, in which he stated, "I do hereby declare and avow, in the most solemn and serious manner, that the Lord Bishop of Bangor never did ask or receive any advice of mine in the preaching or publishing that sermon, nor did I ever read or hear any part of it till the whole was printed and published to the world. And I do further declare and protest, that (God so now help me, and hereafter judge me) I never did say or suggest any such thing to any right reverend prelate, or to any man alive. I believed the contrary, and affirmed the contrary before ever I saw or heard of any advertisement about it."[x] He also denied it in a second advertisement. There is, indeed, every reason to believe

[w] Kennet's Life, 167, 168. Hoadly wrote to Kennet on the subject. Wilkins, author of the Concilia, writing to Nicolson, July 4th, 1717, says: "It is a grief to read the advertisements on account of the bishops being brought in. The Bishop of Bangor's notions have hitherto been the subject of every sermon here. The present disputed veracity will be for a great while every body's talk." This was written from Cambridge. Nicolson's Correspondence, ii. 461.

[x] Kennet's Life, 214, 215. Another controversy also arose out of this branch. Pilloniere, who had been a Jesuit, resided with the Bishop of Bangor as tutor to his family. Snape alludes to him as the bishop's helper in the sermon. Pilloniere then published a history of his life, to which Hoadly wrote a preface. Calamy's Hist. Account, ii. 372, 373. Hoadly was charged with disputing "away the very foundations of faith." Dawson's Suspiria Sacra, 17, 18, dedication, 8vo.

that Nicolson, the learned Bishop of Carlisle, was altogether mistaken. The circumstance, however, occasioned the publication of several pamphlets, which may be regarded as a sort of off-set from the Bangorian controversy. It was unlikely that Hoadly should consult Kennet, with whom he does not appear to have been on terms of intimacy. Further, Hutchinson, who related the story from the Bishop of Carlisle, did not understand it of Dr. Kennet. It is remarkable that the Bishop of Carlisle wrote several letters to Kennet, after the subject had become the topic of conversation, without even hinting that he should have occasion to name him in the business. The bishop was at some loss in fixing the time and the place, when and where the alleged story was related to him, though at length he mentioned that it was told him in Kennet's study. It appears that the Bishop of Carlisle was greatly incensed against Hoadly, in consequence of his Preservative and his Sermon; and in conversations on the subject, Kennet had endeavoured to moderate his lordship's feelings, declaring especially his disapprobation of the conduct of the clergy in attacking a bishop, and adding, that the sermon was guarded with *saving* or *qualifying* words, such as *properly* and *absolutely*. In all probability, the Bishop of Carlisle may have heard that some person had perused the sermon before publication, and he might imagine that Dr. Kennet was the individual, simply from his defence of the Bishop of Bangor. So strongly did Kennet feel on the subject, that he inserted a clause in his will, that he neither "said nor thought any such thing."[y]

[y] Kennet's Life, 168-175, 179, app. 215-252, 277-288. A very severe pamphlet was published against Kennet in connexion with this matter. White proved to be Black, or impossibilities made feasible, in a Letter to Dr. White Kennet, &c., concerning two written by him to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, wherein, like a true master of the art of patchwork, he endeavours to shuffle with and evade the charge brought against him by that Right Reverend Prelate of being an informer. London, 8vo, 1717. The writer says, that he "was constant only in inconstancy, and affirming or denying as it best serves your turn, that have always an eye to advantage and preferment. For had

After some little time, Hoadly published an advertisement, charging the Bishop of Carlisle with forgetfulness, in asserting a fact which was not true, and producing a witness for it who knew nothing of the matter.[z]

To enter further into the Bangorian controversy would be impracticable in this work. The pamphlets are so numerous that few persons have even seen them; and it is certain that few would be tempted to undertake their perusal. This controversy, though other circumstances undoubtedly contributed something towards the decision, induced the government to suspend the regular synodical business of convocation. From that time no royal license has been granted; consequently no actual synodical matters have been transacted. The convocation assembles with every parliament; but the meeting is merely formal. At the same time it exists, and nothing is wanting to enable it to proceed to business but the permission of the crown.

It is gratifying to find that Atterbury and Wake were reconciled long before the controversy arose with Hoadly; nor did they probably differ in their views of the Bishop of Bangor, or of the right of the convocation to transact business. Atterbury appears to have regretted the tone of his book, and to have been anxious for a reconciliation. Writing to Trelawny in 1703-4, he asks how he should act respecting a report that he had asked Wake's pardon for

the Bishop of Bangor not been in great favour at court, you would not have revolted from your friendship to an old acquaintance to take part with latitudinarian schemes of Church government, or rather no government at all." p. 4. The letters and papers on the subject are given in this work. They were also published in a separate form by the Bishop of Carlisle, with a defence of himself. A Collection of Papers scattered lately about the town in the Daily Courant, St. James's Post, &c., with Remarks upon them: 8vo, 1717. The bishop again asserts the truth of his statement, reciting all the particulars respecting Kennet.

[z] Tindal's Cont. iv. 539; Calamy's Hist. Account, ii. 271-277. A controversy relative to the Test Act also arose out of the great question. Sherlock supposed that Hoadly wished to obtain the repeal of the Test Act. Biog. Brit. arts. Sherlock and Hoadly; Chalmers' Biog. Dic.; Calamy's Hist. Account, ii. 378.

some of the expressions of his book, acknowledging himself in error in the controversy in which they had been engaged. He was anxious to be on friendly terms with Wake; yet, in consequence of this report, he was perplexed, lest his conduct might lead the public to believe it. Some few months later, Trelawny forwarded a letter of Wake's to Atterbury. In this letter Wake expresses his apprehension lest the old quarrel should be revived in the chapter of Exeter, of which he was dean; and Atterbury replies, that he is sensible how unbecoming it would be in him to pursue the controversy in the same manner. "I am firmly resolved," he adds, "ever to behave myself towards the dean with the respect that is due to his station. As for the dispute about the rights of convocation, your lordship may depend upon it, that, if ever I pursue it, it shall be in as inoffensive a way as is possible, and with a due acknowledgment of the dean's civilities to me."[a]

In subsequent years Wake was equally anxious with Atterbury for the meeting of convocation, and equally opposed to Hoadly's principles, which were regarded by both as most erroneous. In 1717, Wake, then Archbishop of Canterbury, wished to see the convocation assembled; and the prohibition of its meetings at this period was purely the act of the Whig ministry, in which the governors of the Church were in no way concerned. "The archbishop," says Atterbury, writing on the 8th of November, 1717, "was of opinion that he should be permitted to hold the convocation; and had told the prolocutor (Dr. Stanhope), from whom I had it, that he would adjourn it to-morrow till the 22d, and from thence, by like intermissions, till Christmas, after which the clergy should meet and act. But when I was last in town, I found from good hands that he was as much mistaken on this occasion as he had been on many others; it being resolved in a great council, last week, at Hampton Court, to prorogue the

[a] Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 171, 190, 191.

convocation by a new royal writ till February next. That step, and the turning of Sherlock and Snape out of the chaplainship, will enable your lordship to guess how far the Bishop of Bangor is like to be countenanced and supported. Indeed, my lord, these are very extraordinary steps: the effects of wisdom, no doubt; but of so deep a wisdom, that I, for my part, am not able to fathom it."[b] At this time the Church certainly was not desirous of the suspension of convocations. The matter was entirely managed by the government, in order to punish the Church. From February, therefore, the convocation was prorogued to a still further period. On the 14th of February, before the prorogation, a protest, which had been prepared by Tenison, Archdeacon of Carmarthen, and subsequently Bishop of Ossory, in defence of the royal supremacy and Hoadly's sermon, was read in the house; after which he commenced a speech, which was terminated by the reading of the schedule of prorogation by the prolocutor.[c]

In 1718 Wake supported the Schism Bill, which was opposed by Hoadly. With the Bishop of Bangor, indeed, Archbishop Wake could have had no sympathy. The archbishop quoted Hoadly's book on conformity to shew the inconsistency of the movement; when the Bishop of Bangor said he was misrepresented. "But," says Wilkins, "his grace took out the bishop's book, and quoted the very words by which he made him eat his words."[d]

It is evident that no argument can fairly be derived from Hoadly's case against the revival of convocation; for the controversy, like all the rest from the year 1689, arose out of the circumstances of the country. Yet the opponents of convocation constantly refer to the contests which took place, without caring to ascertain their cause; and then draw their inferences against synodical action. In all these matters the views of the lower house were gene-

[b] Atterbury's Correspondence, iii. 341, 342.

[c] Masters's History of Corpus Christi Coll., &c., 403, app. 112.

[d] Nicolson's Correspondence, ii. 485.

rally received by the great body of the clergy; and the reason is obvious, namely, that being less dependent on the crown than the bishops, it was supposed to speak with more certainty the sentiments of the Church.

We may now notice some transactions subsequent to the year 1717. The controversy raged through the press with great fury for a considerable time; nor were the old subjects of dispute relative to the powers of the two houses forgotten. There are some matters which can be transacted without a license from the crown, such as addresses to the throne, the consideration of grievances, the presentation of petitions, and other kindred subjects. In the year 1728 the upper house made a declaration, or decree, on the subject of the archbishop's claims, which had been so long disputed by the lower house. They declared, "that the method of continuing the lower house is irregular, and contrary to the plain tenour of the archbishop's schedule, and to the known practice of convocation, and such as doth manifestly tend to establish an independence of the lower house upon the upper." It was added, "if it be thought that this declaration ought to have been made sooner, it will be considered how long the prorogations have been made in pursuance of royal writs; and also that the upper house had hopes that the clergy of the lower house would of themselves return to the regular methods."[e]

It was thought at this time that there was an intention of permitting the convocation to act. Probably such would have been the case, if the clergy had evinced a dis-

[e] Reynolds's Historical Essay, 191, 192. The author has this remark on the declaration. "N.B. This decree or declaration was made in an unlicensed synod." The declaration was signed by fifteen bishops. Hopes were entertained that synods would now be permitted to meet, since it was thought that the clergy would relinquish their claims, and that "all impediments would then be removed, which had prevented their proceedings in synod on the plan of reformation assigned at the Revolution." Ib. 204, 205. The convocation presented an address to George II. on his accession, 1728. Act-Books, Upper House, 1728.

position to submit to the archbishop. The advancement, at a later period, of Potter, who had written a learned *Treatise on Church Government*, to the see of Canterbury, confirmed some persons in their opinion that the synod would be permitted to transact business. While these sentiments were entertained, the convocation assembled in 1741. At this period the lower house were inclined to comply with the views of the archbishop, and to yield the points in the controversy; for they consented to stand prorogued by his grace's schedule; not to hold intermediate sessions; and to be discontinued during the session of parliament, whenever his grace might deem it necessary. At this time, therefore, they had returned to what had been termed by the bishops "a sense of duty;" but on the motion being made of certain matters to be submitted to their consideration, another resolution, to the effect that the propositions, though they had been prepared in obedience to the orders of the house, should not be received, was put and carried.[f]

In January 1741-2 the Archdeacon of Lincoln moved the lower house to take into consideration the question of clandestine marriages, ecclesiastical courts, and the qualifications of candidates for holy orders. For a little time the clergy were permitted to meet; the archdeacon's motion was ordered to be reduced to writing, and submitted at the next session. "The clergy had given a specimen of their temper, dutiful inclinations, and disengagement from all former prejudices." At the next session, however, March 5th, it was carried in the house that the propositions of the Archdeacon of Lincoln should not be received. They were rejected "unexamined, undiscussed, unread." On the 20th of May, a member complained of rejecting propositions without inquiry, which had been prepared by order of the lower house of convocation. The archdeacon had published his proposals; and Dr. Chapman replied, that the pamphlet in which they were contained was, in

[f] Reynolds's Essay, 241.

his opinion, a libel on the constitution; and he moved that the author should be censured. Before any resolution could be taken in this matter, the house was prorogued. "The synod was indulged by his majesty's favour in a length of consultation exceeding the term allowed to the council of Nice, or the synods which settled the articles in 1562, or the canons in 1603; yet the only proposition made about business in the lower house was rejected undiscussed, and the introducer of it threatened with censures." Reynolds wrote to Dr. Chapman to ascertain his intentions respecting the next session. But the convocation did not meet; and the only result of the controversy was Reynolds's valuable work, which closes with these words: "The matters therefore intended for the conclusion of this essay are reserved till the leaders in synod are in temper to hear a language agreeable to the principles of the Revolution."[g]

Thus the matter terminated in the convocation; nor has any business, beyond matters of form, been transacted since that time; while no license has been granted since the prorogation in 1717. The controversy between the two houses had now ceased, the clergy having admitted the rights of the archbishop and bishops. It will be observed, that during the disputes between the upper and lower house, the question relative to the sole power of the president to prorogue the convocation had scarcely been touched. At all events it was not decided; and though it was sometimes alluded to, yet all the writers on the side of the upper house waive the question, asserting that it did not affect the matters in dispute between the bishops and the clergy. I regard the question as one which cannot be settled by any discussion; but the following evidence reflects some light on the subject:

Marsh, Archbishop of Dublin, wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury in 1703, when the Irish convocation was revived, for information; and he asks, "Whether, if

[g] Reynolds's Essay, 206, 207, 241, 242, 244.

any one bishop (or two, or a major part of the bishops present) should offer any matter in y^e^ upper house of convocation to be debated, or put to the vote, y^e^ matter may be debated or put to the vote, although the president doth not or will not propose it.

"Whether the president be bound to propose all such matters so offered as aforesaid? or whether he hath a discretional power therein?

"Both which questions may be comprehended in this one, viz. What power y^e^ president in convocation hath in proposing matters to be debated on, and in voting whether he hath only one single voice, or two? or a negative?"

Marsh proceeds, "I have one other request to your grace, which is, y^t^ y^u^ will please to order me a copy of y^e^ writ for proroguing a convocation, because we can find no form of such a writ here."

Appended to this MS., which is in the handwriting of Marsh, is the reply of Tenison, unaddressed. It appears to be the draft of the letter which was sent to Ireland. It is in Tenison's own hand, and is as follows:—

"The way to prove the right in y^e^ president to propose or not propose matters to y^e^ consideration of y^e^ house must be by repeated instances of his refusal to propose what has been offered by the members; and such refusals are not to be met with.

"Without doubt every thing which the bishops debate is regularly proposed to them by the president, who easily discovers the inclinations of the majority, or may put it to the vote, whether this or that shall be proposed, in case the bishops seem to differ in their opinions. In this, and all other votes previous to the final determination of business, the president has the casting vote upon an equality; but to suppose it wholly in his breast what shall be proposed or not proposed, debated or not debated, would be too great a power, greater than the king himself has in parliament.

"After any business in convocation is completed, I

think the consent of the president to be absolutely necessary; and y^e president is perfectly safe in proposing what y^e majority desires, when he is sure it cannot finally be pass'd into an act, nor be published as such, in case he dislike it."[h]

In the reign of Queen Anne the question of the archbishop's power, apart from his suffragans, was only incidentally introduced. Undoubtedly the lower house were in error in their views respecting their own powers; but there is more difficulty in settling the present question. Whenever a prorogation took place, it was made with the consent of the suffragans, because the archbishop and bishops acted in harmony; and the question of the president's sole power was not raised. Still the preceding letter from Tenison may serve to clear up this matter. Supposing the principle, that the archbishop will not act against a majority of his brethren, to be sound, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that he would not prorogue the convocation, in case his suffragans should be opposed, and should wish to discuss matters pertaining to the Church. According to Tenison, such a power would be too great to be vested in one man. Neither is it necessary that the president should exert such power, even supposing him to be possessed of it, since it would be easy, in case the government had resolved on a prorogation, to call in the aid of a royal writ, respecting which there is no doubt. However, I cannot but remark that the arch-

[h] Gibson Mss. vol. i. no. 97, 98. In a postscript to his letter, Marsh alludes to the great storm which had caused so much mischief in England, remarking that in Ireland it was only an ordinary high wind. In the same volume is another letter from Marsh to Tenison in the same year, in which he alludes to the Irish convocation. He hopes the queen will not refuse her writ during the parliament, "thereby to restore the right of the Church before our parliament be dissolved. For we fear, if we do not recover this old right in her majestie's reign, our Church may never be able to obtain it; and if the present opportunity of this parliament be let slip, it being uncertain when we shall have another, we may be debarred that way also." Ib. no. 99.

bishop is not likely to be compelled to have recourse to such an expedient; for the bishops would never persist in opposing a prorogation, were it known that the government of the country had resolved not to permit the convocation to act. Neither is it probable that the president would attempt to exercise such a power, should a majority of his brethren deem it desirable to continue the sessions. At the same time, as the bishops, without expecting a royal license for business, might wish to discuss in convocation such matters as can be considered without such license, and therefore might be anxious to prevent a prorogation until the proposed business had been completed, it may be well to take a dispassionate view of the question, whether the president is at liberty to prorogue against the expressed desires of his suffragans.

By one party in this controversy the president's absolute right is asserted, by the other it is denied; but neither denies the power of the upper house, or the power of the archbishop in conjunction with his brethren. It appears to me to be most desirable that the controversy should not be agitated, and that some concession should be made on either side. In Queen Anne's time, when the disputes between the two houses were raging, the advocates of the upper house, while they sometimes asserted the abstract right of the president, unanimously declare that he would never act in such a matter against the desires of his suffragans, and that they would by no means wish for such an exercise of authority. As no instance is on record in which the president prorogued the convocation in opposition to his brethren, and seeing that even the defenders of the rights of the upper house have ever been opposed to such an exercise of power; surely it is expedient that the question should not be raised, and that in any extreme case, which, however, is not likely to occur, the power of the crown should be called in, that the archbishop might be altogether relieved of so great a responsibility.

As no case occurs in which the president acted in opposition to his suffragans, it would be extremely difficult to prove that he is invested with an absolute right in the matter of prorogations. At the same time, it would be as difficult to establish the contrary or to disprove his right. Under such circumstances, why should the question be discussed?

Such a view, I feel convinced, would have been taken by the advocates of the upper house in the reign of Queen Anne, by Wake, Gibson, Kennet, and others. This is evident from their acknowledgments in their writings. In very many cases the consent of the suffragans is mentioned. It is often said that the archbishop will act with the consent of his brethren. Still, some of the writers, in replying to the argument derived from such expressions, contend for the abstract right in the archbishop, though they would not have it exercised. Thus, Gibson says, "I produce these evidences to shew the general power of the archbishop in determining the times and the days of the convocation's meeting, according to the convenience of his grace and his suffragan bishops."[h] In reply to the other

[h] The Right of the Archbishop to continue, &c. 4to, 1701, p. 49. Gibson elsewhere, supposing the absolute right of proroguing to rest in the president, thus meets the argument respecting the danger of entrusting such power to the individual. "Your meaning can only be, that hereafter there may possibly arise such a metropolitan as the Church hath not known—one who shall resolve to govern by arbitrary methods, &c., and shall not only oppress the clergy, but also deprive them of the regular methods of redress by exercising his authority of continuing the convocation as oft as it shall be summoned together with the parliament." His reply is: "If one should happen to forsake the example of all his predecessors, the prince has a right in law to require the opening and sitting and acting of convocation. Nor will this be the only restraint; but the legislative body will be a constant check upon him, whenever the Church and clergy appear to be in danger from such attempts, and when, by consequence, there is a necessity for their interposing." This argument is based on the supposition of the whole power being in the president; but it is merely proposed as an argument, not positively asserted. Thus he proceeds to the other supposition. "The danger also should be still the less in their account who plead for the consent of the suffragan bishops as necessary in all his grace's continuations, because upon that supposition 'tis out of

side, Gibson admits that the schedule usually runs *cum consensu fratrum;* yet he denies that it was always so, "for in the acts of an elder date, the *consensus fratrum* is neither expressed nor implied in the ordinary continuations, which were made by the sole power of his grace. It is only mentioned sometimes in prorogations to a long distance and in dissolutions. And though the *consent of his brethren* came afterwards by degrees to be entered in the acts, yet it was no law that obliged him to it."[i] Gibson then proceeds to observe, that though the custom of acting with his suffragans had long been continued, yet that "they were admitted to it by a voluntary act of his own." Leaving this question, Gibson asks "what way it concerns the clergy?" Here he was on safe ground; but he by no means settles the other question. The author of the *Schedule Review'd* in like manner evades the question, on the ground that it did not concern the present controversy. "How far a usage of that standing may now oblige the archbishop to consult them, and give their lordships a right to be consulted, as oft as they are present, I cannot say, nor does it at all belong to the present question."[j] Another writer on the same side in the con-

the metropolitan's power to act irregularly; nor can any abuse happen in this matter without the consent of a majority at least of the suffragan bishops. Be pleased now to observe what it is that you so earnestly contend for; that a metropolitan, acting with the consent of his bishops, is not fit to be trusted, as metropolitans ever have been, with the determination of time in this synod." Reflections on the Expedient, &c. 1702, 4to, pp. 6, 7.

[i] Ib. 121, 122. Dr. Phillimore mentions, that almost always in the Registers of the Upper House from 1702 to 1725 the consent is registered.

[j] The Schedule Review'd, &c. 1702, 4to, p. 46. The writer alludes to prorogations when the clergy are not present, to shew that the Act of Continuation does not "absolutely require or presuppose the consent of the bishops." This is perfectly true; but it may be answered, that if the bishops take not the trouble to attend, their consent is presumed. The question is, not whether the bishops must be present, but whether the archbishop can act in opposition to their declared wish when they are present. Elsewhere the writer says: "Granting that such entries did infer a necessity of the suffragans' consent, what is that to the inferior clergy?" Ib. 17.

troversy admits that the archbishop continues "with advice and consent of his brethren."[k] Gibson says expressly that the president had never acted without asking the consent of his brethren. Since, therefore, all the advocates of the archbishop's powers, while they would not deny his sole right to prorogue, considered it necessary that his suffragans should be consulted; and as no instance can be produced in which the president continued the convocation against the wishes of his brethren, it would be very unwise in our day, when the question is still more difficult to settle than it was in the reign of Queen Anne, to endeavour to revive such a controversy.

In a matter of such importance, the responsibility should not perhaps be lodged in any one individual; or if it really does rest with him, it might be desirable that it should be exercised in conjunction with the suffragans. "Upon this long controversy it may be pardonable to make one observation: that how clear soever the evidence came out in support of the president's claims, yet it is still a problem, whether it was expedient to recall the practice of synods in the corruptest times to be made a rule and standard in a Church reformed."[l] "Synods," says this learned writer, "are the most ancient and approved method of ecclesiastical government, and as they were from the beginning, so ought to be used and continued in this Church through all ages."[m] This was said to vindicate the Church against the Romish historian, under the name of Dod, who charged it with a parliamentary origin. Yet he was a strenuous defender of the Revolution. "In this

[k] Present State of Convocation, &c. 1702, 4to, p. 30. Sir W. Page Wood, in his opinion on the case submitted to counsel, contends for the absolute right of the archbishop; arguing that the bishops were consulted by courtesy, not as a matter of right. But he uses a very strange argument to illustrate his opinion, namely, that "if the sovereign had money, there is nothing to prevent her from delaying to call parliament as long as she pleases." This is a singular doctrine for these times, though it may have done very well for the period previous to the Revolution.

[l] Reynolds, 193.

[m] Ib. 35.

crisis the deliverer of our country, the restorer of liberty, and protector of Protestantism, gave the commission to the clergy to enable them to retrieve the honour of the Church." He condemns the lower house during the proceedings of the reigns of William, Anne, and George I.; but he saw that the divisions were widened by party feeling under the last sovereign. By private writers it was maintained that some of the clergy were disaffected to the government. "A very unusual way this of bringing men to temper, to add to the occasion of their complaint, by what they could not but resent as a further grievance."[n]

It was admitted by Wake and Gibson, and all the men of that party who took the opposite view to Atterbury, that convocations should frequently meet. "I make no doubt but that it is the duty as well as wisdom of a Christian king to consult of all these matters with those who have the government of it committed to them by God; and by their direction and assistance to manage himself in the exercise of this great branch of his royal supremacy; and neither obstinately to refuse the clergy liberty to assemble, when they think it would be for the service of the Church and the benefit of religion to come together. Should it so fall out that the prince should neglect his duty in this particular, and so not give his clergy the opportunity of meeting and acting, when it would be of a

[n] Ib. 188, 190, 191. In the Observations of the Bishops, in 1704, on a paper presented by the lower house, is a passage which appears to indicate their sense of their concurrent power with the president. "The constitution having lodged in us the power of prorogation, as in all governments, ecclesiastical or civil, trusts must be lodged somewhere; and, in fact, are always lodged in the hands of superiors, in confidence that they will discharge them to the benefit of the community; we hereupon further assured them, that when business shall be before the convocation, the president, with the consent of his suffragans, will so order the prorogations, that there shall be sufficient and convenient time allowed for the considering and finishing it." So, in 1728, the bishops say: "We do further declare, that inasmuch as the whole convocation is prorogued by the archbishop, with consent of his suffragans in the upper house, in which prorogation both the bishops and clergy are expressly included." Act-Books, Upper House, 1728.

real benefit to the Church that they should assemble and provide for the estate of it, in that case I conceive it would be the duty of those who are the fathers and governors of it to apply to him for his commission to come together, to remonstrate with humility, but yet with a Christian freedom too, the necessities of the Church, the evils that are to be remedied, and the reason they have to hope that, by their assembling, they may provide some remedy. When this is done, if the prince shall continue deaf to their remonstrances, then, indeed, they may have just cause to complain that he abuses his authority, and to consider what is next to be done for the honour of God and the safety of the Church committed to them. Should we ever be so unhappy, under a Christian magistrate, as to be denied all liberty of these assemblies, though the governors and fathers of the Church should, with all their care and interest, endeavour to obtain it,—should he so abuse his prerogative as to turn it not only to the detriment but to the ruin of all true religion and morality among us; in such case of extremity, I have before said, and I still adhere to it, that the bishops and pastors of the Church must resolve to hazard all in the discharge of their duty." "When the exigencies of the Church call for a convocation, then, I do confess, the Church has a right to its sitting."[o]

Wake's opinion evidently was, that a majority of the bishops were to judge whether circumstances required the action of convocation, and that in such a case it would be harsh in the prince to resist their wishes. With such views, Wake, even if the president's sole right had been a settled question, could not have recommended that it should be exercised, and discussion thereby prevented, against the wishes of his suffragans.

But, as we have already shewn, the question was not attempted to be decided, because the president and his suffragans were agreed, and their disputes were with the

[o] Wake's State, 85, 86.

lower house. In denying the right of the clergy to adjourn themselves, the author of the *Schedule Review'd*, while he is unable to decide whether the power is with the president alone or in conjunction with his suffragans, says, "the bishops have this plea for the necessity of their consent, viz. that the upper house books mention the archbishop's continuations or prorogations as made *de et cum consensu confratrum:*" yet he thinks that the practice was introduced "upon the archbishop's consulting with his brethren what day would be most for the common convenience of all, before the register was suffered to enter it in the schedule, or the acts of the house."[p] While he inclines to the opinion, that formerly the sole right was in the archbishop, he says: "I deny not but an instrument originally intended to be the act of a singular person, and accordingly running in his name alone, may be brought by subsequent custom necessarily to presuppose the consent of others. Thus, though the schedule of continuation say nothing of the consent of the bishops, yet there is reason to believe that ever since the year 1562, the archbishop has not used to proceed to the publication of that act without the consent of his suffragans (when present) as to the day to which he continued; and how far a usage of that standing may now oblige the archbishop to consult them, and give their lordships a right to be consulted as oft as they are present, I cannot say, nor does it at all belong to the present question."[q]

Instances, moreover, occur, in which the president, during the disputes between the two houses, took the opinion of his suffragans respecting a prorogation. "The archbishop, by counsel and consent of his suffragans, could think no time more proper to prorogue both houses than at this juncture." "He does this with advice and consent of his suffragan brethren; and yet when he makes the act into a formal instrument, he does not so much as mention the

[p] The Schedule Reviewed, &c. pp. 16, 17.
[q] Ib. p. 46.

consent of his brethren in that instrument."[r] "The continuation is pronounced by the metropolitan, who, advising with his brethren the bishops, directs the business of convocation, and is at the head of proceedings in both houses; nay (which is more) has a final negative upon them, and by his concurrence gives the sanction to their acts: in all matters to the framing and promulging thereof the royal license and authority are not necessary in law."[s]

I see not how the matter could be settled were the archbishop and bishops to be at issue on the subject; but it appears to me that in our present circumstances the president and his suffragans should labour to act in concert. If a majority of the bishops wish to prevent a prorogation, in order that important matters may be discussed, the president would not be likely to exercise his authority against their wishes, even supposing that no doubt could be entertained respecting his absolute right; much less would he be likely to do so when the subject is so encompassed with difficulties. My hope is, that such a question will not be agitated; and I would recommend that the principle laid down in Tenison's letter should in every case be regarded. Let the president and his suffragans act in concert; and if the bishops wish to prolong a discussion or to open new subjects, let the synod be continued from day to day, or from time to time, according to the convenience of the two houses, until all such matters as it may be desirable to introduce have been fully considered. The passages already quoted prove that in the early part of the last century the question was viewed as so difficult as not to admit of a solution. The difficulties in the way of its settlement at present are much greater. Under these circumstances, therefore, the obvious course is not to raise the question.

[r] The Present State of Convocation, p. 30. Atterbury, in contending for the lower house, desired "that all authority of the archbishop might be expressed *cum consensu fratrum*," giving as a reason, "that since 'tis well known the archbishop does not prorogue without consent of his brethren, though such consent is not mentioned in the schedule." Ib. 14.

[s] Synodus Ang. app. 245, 246.

Intimately connected with the question of the president's power to prorogue the convocation, is that of the royal license, or how far the synod can proceed without such license. It was admitted on both sides in the controversy in the last century, that many things could be transacted without it; and the history of convocations proves that they frequently met and proceeded to business without even applying for the permission of the crown to treat of canons. Any thing short of actually enacting canons may be done without a license. "Most of our synods, which have been specially authorised by license to make canons, did likewise treat, debate, and come to synodical resolutions upon other matters besides the making new canons. And yet, whoever casts an eye upon our two most ancient licenses, in 1586 and 1603, will find that those licenses are not a commission to treat, debate, and conclude at large, but only upon certain matters to be formed into canons. The inference is, that there was understood to remain in the synod an ordinary inherent power to treat upon any other matters of ecclesiastical concernment for any other purpose besides the making new canons. The royal license for making new canons, which some men take to be an indication of the absolute disability of synods when unlicensed, being a clear evidence of their authority to proceed as a provincial court and council in all matters except the conception of canons."[t]

In the last century, when convocations met and acted, the first business after the preliminary matters, such as the

[t] Reynolds's Essay, 212, 213. In 1661 business was transacted and orders were made before any license was issued. Wake admits that the convocation, even without a license, is not prevented from debating on ecclesiastical matters: "provided it be only in order to petition their prelates and primate, and by them their prince, for a license to proceed further, I do humbly conceive that the clergy may, without any license from the crown, confer and treat about such matters as may be fit to be enacted by them, provided that they do so confer and treat, not in order to constitute any canons, but in order to apply to the prince, if they shall think fit, to proceed." When Atterbury asserts that none of the convocations since the time of James I. took

choice of a prolocutor and an address to the crown, usually related to the schedules of reformation from the diocesan proctors. These were received and considered. The representatives of the various dioceses submitted their grievances to the synod; their cases were heard, and conclusions were arrived at according to the circumstances. The same thing occurred under Queen Elizabeth; and from her reign to that of George I. we frequently meet with representations about discipline. And were convocation only to meet for this single purpose, how much good might be accomplished! Every thing of importance connected with each diocese would be submitted to the synod, by whom a remedy might be devised. "Upon the supposition that nothing can be done without a license, the whole order is inverted; that is, they whose profession it is to take heed, watch, premonish, are no longer to exercise their office of overseers, but are to receive motion from those to whom it is their duty to communicate it, and, instead of monitors, are turned into the executors of predetermined purposes and councils."[u] There is no want of power, except to make canons; and even a license ought to be granted, according to the opinions of all the men on both sides who took part in the controversy in the time of King William, Queen Anne, and George I., whenever the bishops and clergy assembled in convocation may represent to the crown that it is required by the circumstances of the Church. In no other way, except in the synod, can the Church speak. This was well understood in the last century by the infidel writers, who argued, that the sup-

licenses except they were about to treat of canons, Wake admits the fact. "I do humbly insist upon it that no restraint has been laid upon the clergy in convocation, but only in the point of attempting and enacting. In all other matters I account them still at liberty, not only to treat, but to resolve too, as they did before." Wake's State, 536, 614, 618.

[u] Reynolds, 214, 216. Beveridge declared his opinion, "that convocations were of right to be assembled concurrently with parliaments, and might treat and come to many preparatory resolutions without a royal license." Present State of Convocation, p. 9.

pression of synods would be a benefit. But apart from the license and the enacting of canons, how many evils might be rectified, were the proctors of the clergy encouraged to submit to the synod a representation of the wants and desires of the dioceses to which they belong! Petitions on any subject connected with the Church might be presented with some hope of redress. A royal license is not required at present. Some years even might be profitably spent in discussing matters in convocation, in considering our wants, in devising remedies for existing evils, and preparing measures for future adoption; and afterwards, when the two houses were agreed upon any schemes which might appear likely to be of advantage to the Church, the royal license might be granted to enable the synod to give them their regular sanction preparatory to the confirmation of the crown and of parliament.

CHAPTER XV.

The question of the Revival of Convocations considered—The Revival shewn to be reasonable, and for the benefit of the Church—The question of Changes in the Liturgy considered—Alterations to be deprecated—The attempt to change not to be apprehended—Reasons for this conclusion—Candles on Communion-table—Arrangement of services—Example of the Civil Wars—Articles—Canons—Topics suggested—Psalmody—Versions of the Psalms—Conformity—Consecration of Churches—Suffragan Bishops—The Revival of Convocation—The arguments of opponents considered.

Having traced the history of Anglican councils from the earliest period, this chapter may be devoted to the consideration of certain topics, which could not be introduced in the body of the work without interrupting the connexion of the narrative. In the previous chapter I have shewn that many things could be transacted without a license; and that it would be desirable to meet for discussion before the power to enact canons is granted. But should a license be granted, no danger need be apprehended from the deliberations of convocation, since no business can even be entertained without the concurrence of the crown, inasmuch as it can at any time interpose its authority by issuing a writ of prorogation. It is certainly desirable that they should be permitted to act at certain seasons; not, perhaps, during every session of parliament, but whenever any thing might arise which could be better settled in a convocation than in another assembly. The subjects would be recommended by the crown, while no decision would be of any force until sanctioned by the queen. At any moment a check might be interposed, supposing, which is not likely, that either house should be disposed to cast difficulties in the way of the settlement of such questions as might be brought under their consideration. That it would be for

the advantage of the Church, therefore, for the convocation to meet, must, I think, be admitted by every unprejudiced person who thoroughly examines the question. As the crown must add its confirmations before any measure could become the law of the Church, the government could not be inconvenienced even if the convocation should act counter to its recommendations, for the remedy is in their own hands, namely, a prorogation. Nor can it be reasonably imagined that, supposing the convocation to pursue such a course, the government would incur any odium by putting an end to their deliberations. On the contrary, the odium would attach to the clergy, as unreasonable men, who would not be satisfied with what was just and practicable. On this ground the government would be perfectly safe. But really there is no cause for any such apprehension. The crown would not recommend any proceedings which would not be calculated to advantage the Church; nor would the convocation reject any such measure recommended by the crown.

The question may be asked, What business could they transact? It must be borne in mind that all canons or rules would be submitted to the convocation through the archbishop as president. The archbishop and the crown would decide upon the measures; the former would act with the concurrence of his suffragans, while the crown would be guided by the experience and advice of the metropolitan. And it is certain that any measure recommended by his grace and the bishops would be sanctioned by the lower house.

A few observations may be offered on the topics which might be expected to fall within the province of the convocation, supposing its powers to be revived.

We may first consider the question of alterations in the Liturgy. The convocation is the only place where such a subject could be entertained; and the chief objection with some persons to the revival of its powers is the fear that the Liturgy might be tampered with. In my

opinion the Liturgy must be preserved in its integrity, or the most serious consequences would ensue; but I have no apprehensions of danger on this head from the revival of the convocation.

Any material change in the Liturgy is out of the question. It could not, as I conceive, be attempted, even were any persons rash enough to introduce the subject, or so inconsistent as to wish it. The various differences existing among the clergy on minor points would act as a safeguard against any material change in the Liturgy of the Anglican Church. All would be anxious to preserve it unaltered; all would be unwilling to entertain the question of change, lest something which they themselves value should be recommended for alteration by others.

That the subject would be calmly entertained, I am convinced. Whatever differences may exist, yet on the necessity of preserving the Liturgy there would be a general agreement; for all the clergy fearing, if a course of innovation should be commenced, that it could not be checked, and wishing to avoid change lest something might be relinquished which they would retain, would concur in guarding this legacy from our Reformers with the utmost jealousy. Though, therefore, the question of alterations might be introduced, yet I am convinced that, from the causes already specified, the utmost extent to which the majority in either house would be inclined to go, would be to submit the Liturgy to the consideration of convocation, with a view simply and only to some few *verbal alterations*, the *correction of some obvious oversights at the last review*, and the *setting at rest some doubtful rubrics*. Beyond this, no man who loves the Church, and reveres the memory of the Reformers, would venture to proceed; and I am convinced that to proceed further would be impossible, for our very divisions would tend to the preservation of our formularies unaltered, except in those cases which have been specified. A few instances, by way of illustration, under each of these heads, may be mentioned.

With regard to *verbal alterations*. It is well known that some words have undergone a considerable change since our Liturgy was framed. In such cases the convocation might deem it desirable to substitute words which would now convey to the common people the exact ideas which were intended by the compilers of our Book of Common Prayer. The word *prevent* in the sense of *going before*, and *let* in the sense of *hindering*, are instances in point. To alter these and similar words, or any words not now commonly understood by the people, would be only following out the principle of the Reformers, who, in all their proceedings, ever specially regarded the poor and the ignorant. Such alterations involve no change of meaning. The Liturgy would remain in all its integrity. On this point enlargement is unnecessary, since a very few words only would be changed.

Obvious oversights at the last review may next be specified. Let it be remembered that the whole work was accomplished within a very brief space. Even during that short period there were many days when nothing whatever was done in convocation. The time, therefore, was too short for the revision. It was necessary to accomplish it by a given period; but the consequence was, that some few points were overlooked. My remark applies to the rubrics. One instance, by way of illustration, will be sufficient. In the Book of Common Prayer, prior to the last review, there is the following direction: "*Item. So oft as the first chapter of St. Matthew is read, either for Lesson or Gospel, yee shall begin the same at 'The birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise.' And the third chapter of St. Luke's Gospel shall be read unto, 'So that he was supposed to be the sonne of Joseph.'*" Now it is clear that this direction was overlooked in 1661; and what is the consequence? Few clergymen read the proper names in those chapters, and yet they have no authority for the omission. There are but few of what I designate oversights, but it is competent for convo-

cation to correct them; nor could any man reasonably object to such a proceeding.

Under the third head, namely, the *Settlement of doubtful rubrics and directions*, there would confessedly be more difficulty. Still the difficulty might be overcome. It is evident that some of the rubrics were intended to be open. These might still remain so. That, for instance, relative to the situation of the communion-table need not be altered; for though the place is not fixed by the rubric, it is now settled by long custom and usage; so that the most perfect uniformity is the consequence. Every clergyman, however, knows, that in some few particulars there is a variety in our practice; one man adopting one interpretation of a rubric, another an opposite. These are matters, doubtless, of comparatively slight importance; but still it is desirable that our uniformity should be complete. Instances will occur to every clergyman. I shall only specify some few matters, which are not so obvious, or not generally understood.

I have already, in alluding to the *Apocryphal Lessons*, shewn that the *Admonition* prefixed to the *Second Book of Homilies* is of no authority, and cannot honestly be pleaded by any one. The *Apocryphal Lessons* are settled by the rubrics, and do not fall under consideration in this discussion. But there are other matters respecting which differences of opinion exist, and yet *authority* is pleaded. Such is the question of *candles on the communion-table*. In my opinion, the practice is a matter of indifference; and it would not have been noticed in this work had not some persons in the present day pleaded authority in its favour. The authority alleged is the following rubric:—*And here it is to be noted, that such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.*

Now the question arises, what ornaments were sanctioned by parliament in the second year of King Edward? Certain Injunctions were issued before the removal of altars from the churches, by which *two lights* were permitted to remain on the high altar: "and shall suffer from henceforth no torches, nor candles, tapers or images of wax, to be set afore any image or picture, but only *two lights* upon the high altar."[a] During the next year, in Ridley's Visitation Articles it is inquired, "Whether they suffer any torches, candles, tapers, or any other *light* to be in your churches, but only *two lights* upon the high altar."[b] The persons who plead the authority of the rubric, only use candles *unlighted;* whereas if any practice is authorised, it must be that of *lighted* candles. Taking their view of the rubric, it is violated as much by placing *unlighted* candles on the communion-table as by the omission. Further, it should be remembered that when the Injunction respecting lights was issued, communion-tables were not in use, since altars still remained in all our churches. I cannot, therefore, conceive how the argument from the Injunctions bears at all upon the subject.

There is another question which must never be overlooked in the consideration of this subject. The rubric authorised such things only as were appointed by act of parliament in the second year of King Edward. Were candles and candlesticks ordered by act of parliament to be placed on the communion-table? Whatever may have been the case with altars, it is certain that no parliament ever ordered lighted candles to be placed on communion-tables.

I must, therefore, remind those who plead for the practice in question, that the rubric cannot possibly be

[a] Injunccions geven by the moste excellent Prince Edward the Sixte, by the grace of God King of England, Fraunce, and Irelande, defender of the faythe, and in earthe under Christe of the Churche of Englande and of Irelande the supreme hedde, to all and singuler his lovyng subjects, as well of the clergie as of the laietie. Imprinted at London the laste daie of Julii, in the first yere of our sovereigne, &c. 1547, 4to.

[b] Sparrow's Collection.

pleaded in favour of candles *unlighted*. On their own principle, they must place two *lighted* candles, or *two lights*, on the table; and surely they will not contend that such a practice is authorised by the Church. So again, if the Injunction is to be followed in this particular at all, it must be complied with strictly. Now it specifies that the *two lights* are to be set upon the high altar. We have no *altars* in our churches. *Tables* were substituted by our Reformers. It cannot be argued that the table is called an altar; for when the Injunction, which is pleaded, was issued, altars actually remained in the churches; and the intention was that two lighted candles should remain on the principal one, while they were removed from all the rest. In a very short time after the Injunctions were issued, altars were removed; and can it be supposed that the *two lights* were not removed with them? If, then, the rubric in question bears the interpretation which the advocates for the practice put upon it, they must admit that it is incumbent on them to set up altars, and to place on them, not candles *unlighted*, but *two lights*. The two things must stand or fall together, as far as the rubric is concerned. But there is no evidence whatever to shew that lights were retained after altars were removed. On the contrary, it is certain that they were removed; and that whatever ornaments were in use in King Edward's second year, lighted candles on the communion-table were not among the number.

In my opinion, the practice is one of perfect indifference. I cannot discover any thing popish in two candlesticks on our communion-tables; but the custom is unauthorised by the rubrics; and I am certain that the Reformers did not intend to sanction it. This, then, would be a fair question for the consideration of convocation. It would be for them to ascertain what was intended by or comprehended in the rubric; and after due deliberation, they would come to a decision on the subject. Without commending or censuring the practice itself, the

convocation might determine whether it was or was not comprehended in the rubric, and thus the question would be set at rest by authority.

A remark may be offered in this place on the use of the term *altar* as applied to the communion-table. The term itself was rejected from our services at an early period of the Reformation; and the question naturally arises, is it wise to revive it? In a metaphorical sense, or as expressive of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, I see no objection whatever to the use of the term in reference to the communion-table; but it must not be forgotten that the Church has not given her sanction to its adoption in any sense. It is indeed retained in the coronation-service; but this form was never authorised by the Church, so that it is competent for our sovereigns to use the old form or to appoint a new one, by virtue of the supremacy. The use of the term, therefore, in that service has nothing to do with the question; and though it was allowed in the above sense by the canons of 1640, yet no argument can thereby be derived for its adoption.

Another practice may also be mentioned, which is a thing of trivial consequence in itself, but which is not authorised by the Church, namely, that of turning to the east when the creed is repeated. The safer course is to follow the injunctions of the Church, without deviations on either side. But it may be questioned whether turning to the east, inasmuch as it is not prescribed by the Church, is not actually prohibited by the following clause in the Act of Uniformity:—"And be it further enacted, that no form or order of common prayers, administration of sacraments, *rites* or *ceremonies*, shall be openly used in any church, chapel, or other public place, other than what is prescribed and appointed to be used in and by the said book." This clause, in my opinion, prohibits the use of any ceremony not actually prescribed; and though I view the use of the term *altar* and the practice of turning to the east as matters of perfect in-

difference in themselves, and as no more popish than the dissenting practice of sitting at what is termed the administration of the ordinance, and also in the act of singing; yet as neither is sanctioned by the Church, I cannot but conceive, at all events in times like the present, that it is more prudent to avoid them altogether.[c]

The arrangement of our various services is a question which has given rise to differences of opinion, and in some cases to a difference in practice. It has been argued, that the Reformers intended the Communion-service to be used at a different time from the daily prayers. This assertion is often made by those who wish to remodel the services of the Church; and many, who have no such wish, take it for granted that the assertion is correct. It is, however, altogether erroneous. The services never were separated, nor were they ever intended to be so. From the period of the Reformation the Communion-service has succeeded the daily prayers, as is the custom at present. Undoubtedly some of the clergy were accustomed to separate them in the time of Queen Elizabeth; but the practice was checked by the following injunction from Archbishop Grindall: "The minister not to pause or stay between the Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion, but to continue and say Morning Prayer, Litany, Communion, or the service appointed to be said (when there was no communion) together, without any intermission; to the intent that the people might continue together in prayer, and hearing the word of God, and not depart out of the church during all the time of the whole divine service."[d] From

[c] In matters that are fixed, no clergyman can follow his own inclination; nor can he, as an honest man, choose his own course, since he has solemnly pledged himself to conform to that which is appointed by the Church. "A minister is not at liberty to use or to refuse what prayers he pleases in the publick service, but must be governed by the rubrick; men may and must be left to their discretion in things doubtful: but when there is a rule, a modest man will not be wise above it, and much less against it." Bishop of St. Asaph's Charge, 1712, 8vo, p. 8.

[d] Strype's Grindal, 167.

the various occasional forms published at a subsequent period, it is evident that the daily service and the Communion-office were always used together on Sundays and holy days; for in all these forms the two are printed as one complete service, to be used at one time. As, however, the separation has even recently been practised, and not only practised but defended, the convocation could settle the matter by a simple declaration on the subject.[e]

The only services which were formerly separated were the *Daily Morning Prayer* and the *Litany*. Until the last review, the Litany was read alone in some places; though I cannot conceive on what authority. The rubric was as follows: "Here followeth the Litany, to be used upon Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other times when it shall be commanded by the ordinary." Now the Morning and Evening Prayer were then, as now, enjoined to be used daily; so that the use of the Litany could not set aside another injunction. No one will pretend that the Morning Prayer was not to be used on Sundays; and the Litany was appointed to be used on Sundays also. The latter did not supersede the former; and the same argument will apply to Wednesdays and Fridays; so that there appears to have been no authority for the substitution of the Litany in the room of the Morning Prayers. Wheatly and others suppose that it was said at a different time; but from the rubric in the Scotch Prayer-book in 1637, it is clear that it was the practice with some persons to omit the morning service altogether on Litany days. In that book the following words are added to the

[e] In the early period of the Reformation, some short interval elapsed after the close of the service before the celebration of the communion. Thus an eminent ritualist observes: "It is very probable, though the assembly did not dissolve, yet was there such a ceasing and rest from sacred employments as might give the curate time in that interval both to receive the names of such as intended to communicate, as also to admonish, and in case of obstinacy to repel, scandalous persons from that ordinance." Le Strange's Alliance, 163. The ambiguity was removed at the last review, when it was ordered that notice should be given the day before.

rubric: "*and without omission of any part of the other daily service of the Church on those days.*" Whether the Litany was intended to be said at a different time of the day is another question; but it is, I think, certain that the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer never contemplated that the daily service should be omitted. The question was, however, set at rest at the last review; and I notice it simply for the purpose of shewing that the alteration of the rubric, so as to leave it no longer doubtful whether the Litany should be said in addition to the daily service, was not a departure, as some have contended, from the intentions of the compilers.[f]

It has been sometimes argued, that our morning service was composed of three offices, which were intended to be used at different times; but there is no authority whatever for such a notion. In the time of Queen Elizabeth a longer pause occurred probably between the sermon and the Communion-service than at present; yet even then the service was but one. No evidence exists to prove that the Litany was ever intended to be a distinct office. A rubric in the very first occasional form published in Queen Elizabeth's reign reflects some light on the subject. "After the Morning Prayer ended, the minister shall exhort the people assembled to give themselves to their private prayers and meditations; for which purpose a pause shall be made of one quarter of an hour and more by the discretion of the said curate, during which time as good silence shall be kept as may be; that done, the Litany is to be read."[g] This practice was probably

[f] A somewhat singular permission was granted by the First Book of King Edward to substitute lessons in some cases for the litany. Thus "also upon Christmas Daye, Easter Daye, the Ascension Daye, Whitsundaye, and the Feaste of the Trinity, may be used any part of Holy Scripture hereafter to be certaynly limited and appointed, in the steade of the litany."

[g] A Fourme to be used in Common Prayer twise aweeke, and also an Order of Publique Fast, to be used every Wednesday in the weeke duryng this time of Mortalitie. London, 1563. 4to.

found inconvenient, for we find that it was discouraged by the bishops; and in the subsequent forms the whole service is printed in one continued order, to be used at one time, as at present; while Grindal's injunction shews that the separation of the service, or the pause in its celebration, was never general. Various incidental notices occur in later times bearing somewhat on the subject. In 1627, Cosin asks, in his Visitation Articles, "doth he upon Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays add over and above unto the ordinary service of the morning the Litany and suffrages, according to the laws and canons provided?" "When upon Sundays and holidays established by law, and upon the whole week before Easter, doth he read the second service, with the epistle and gospel, according to the Book of Common Prayer after the former service, which is the Morning Prayer and the Litany, be ended?" These two questions comprehend the whole service; but there is another. "When the sermon is ended, doth he return unto the holy table, and there proceed and make an end of the whole service, as he is likewise directed to do in the communion-book?" From these questions, as well as from the proceedings of the bishops at an earlier period, it would seem that some clergymen were inclined to abridge the morning service; and hence probably originated the notion of three distinct offices. But the general practice of the Church from the Reformation has been precisely the same as at present; and any deviations therefrom merely prove that some of the clergy were irregular. "The order of Morning Prayer is not, nor ever was, the whole morning service, but a little fragment thereof. The Act of Parliament, 1 Elizabeth, c. ii. calls it service, not services; and the contents of our Liturgie (which is our rubrick confirmed) followeth the old distinction in King Henry's Prime."[h]

Johnson of Cranbrook asserted that three services were united,—the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Com-

[h] Holy Table, Name and Thing, &c. pp. 174-176.

munion-office. He imagined that as the Litany is ordered to be said after Morning Prayer, the interval is at the discretion of the minister.[i] The notion was founded altogether in error. The word *after* in the rubric simply means at *the end.* Previous to the Restoration the Morning Prayer ended with the third collect, and then the Litany was read; but the congregation did not depart from the church, neither did the minister leave his desk; he proceeded with the service. At the review of the book in 1661, the Morning Prayer was made to end with the "grace of our Lord," and the Litany was included. After the third collect we have a rubric, "then these five prayers are to be read here, except when the Litany is read;" consequently the Litany on litany-days was read at the same part of the service.[j] Such has ever been the practice; nor can any ingenuity shew that this arrangement was not intended from the beginning. With respect to the Lord's supper, the time of the day is not fixed by any rubrics, neither is the time of the sermon fixed; yet the usage of the Church ever since the Book of Common Prayer was compiled has decided that the one should be preached and the other administered at the end of Morning Prayer. In all the occasional forms from Elizabeth's accession to the time of the Long Parliament, when our Liturgy was set aside, the Litany invariably follows the daily morning service, without any pause; and after the Litany the Communion-office, called sometimes the second service, and at others the latter service, as far as the prayer for the Church militant. These various forms settle the question as to the practice of the Church from the Reformation. Our ancestors saw no ambiguity in the rubrics. They commenced the Litany immediately after the daily service.[k]

[i] Johnson's Vade Mecum.

[j] Lewis's Case of Fasts and Festivals, &c. pp. 27, 28.

[k] I have a large collection of these occasional forms previous to the time of the Long Parliament; and in every case the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion-office are connected together as one continued service.

There are several rubrics which may admit of different interpretations, and which are differently interpreted by the clergy; and though the remedy in such cases is an appeal to the ordinary, who has authority to decide, yet it would be far better to have the matter settled by convocation, in order that one uniform practice might prevail in every diocese.

With respect to the Liturgy, therefore, no consistent member of the Anglican Church would recommend alterations beyond such as would fall under the three heads already specified; while the very fears of the clergy would be conservative, and tend to preserve it against innovation.

It is a source of thankfulness that no changes were effected in 1689, and in the reign of Queen Anne, when points would have been yielded which every sound Churchman must now have deplored. Though I would not justify the proceedings of the lower house of convocation in 1689, or in subsequent years in the reign of Queen Anne; yet I frankly acknowledge that I am thankful that the opposition was made to the upper house, for I am convinced that it was overruled to the preservation of our Liturgy. In 1689, in 1700, and in subsequent years, when the disputes between the two houses were of a most painful character, the bishops were disposed to make concessions which could not be justified. I would not for a moment have it supposed that I consider that such men as Tillotson, Tenison, Stillingfleet, and others, were indifferent on the subject; but I am convinced that they attached too much importance to the objections of Dissenters, and that they imagined, that by making the required concessions, they would be gained over to the Church. In their anxiety to comprehend Dissenters, they were prepared to give offence to members of the Church by unwarrantable concessions. Had the changes been made, the end would not have been attained; for the objectors would soon have entertained scruples on other points; while it would have been difficult, when once the example had been set, to

have resisted any demands, however unreasonable. Thus the Liturgy might have been subjected to constant alterations. In consequence of the opposition of the lower house all this mischief was prevented; nor can I avoid the conclusion, that this feeling operated strongly on the minds of the majority. Their apprehensions lest the bishops should go too far in one direction might certainly have led them too far in another; but that good has resulted from the differences between the two houses is certain. Had the upper house succeeded in their schemes, changes would have been made which we should have now regretted. We are enjoying the benefits of that opposition. It was overruled for the welfare of the Church.

On this question the views of the commissioners at the Savoy conference in 1661 were much more just than those of King William's commission in 1689. The former remark, in reply to the Presbyterians, "On the contrary, we judge that if the Liturgy should be altered as thus required, not only a multitude, but the generality of the soberest and most loyal children of the Church of England would be justly offended, since such an alteration would be a virtual concession, that this Liturgy were an intolerable burden to tender consciences, a direct cause of schism, a superstitious usage, which would at once both justify all those who have so obstinately departed from it, as the only pious tender-conscienced men, and condemn all those who have adhered to that in conscience of their duty and loyalty, with their loss or hazard of estates, lives, and fortunes, as men superstitious, schismatical, and void of religion and conscience." This argument was too much lost sight of by the advocates of concession in 1689. Nor did they fully bear in mind that their concessions would have been a virtual acknowledgment that the Reformers had imposed some things unadvisedly. Kennet's remark on the above extract is so just, that it is suited to all times as well as to the period when he wrote. "And, indeed, this was the most plausible objection in the convocation of

1689, when possibly the Liturgy altered would have given occasion for a new separation, upon grounds more popular than nonjuring or lay deprivations."[1]

Now, however, there would be no danger, either of a collision between the two houses, or of a desire on the part of any considerable number of the clergy to make any extensive changes in our formularies.

I do not mean to assert that there are not persons among the clergy who would individually desire alterations. Some, for instance, might wish to expunge the Athanasian Creed, others probably might desire the removal of other portions of the Liturgy, while the advocates of the *Tracts for the Times* would revive or restore certain passages respecting prayers for the dead, and the eucharistic sacrifice, which were retained in the first Book of Common Prayer under King Edward; but the impossibility of altering, so as to give satisfaction to all, would induce the great body of the clergy to support any motion for the preservation of the Liturgy in its integrity.

But the advocates for alterations in the Liturgy are so few, that no danger need be apprehended. Yet as it is our duty to read history with a view to our own profit, a reference to the state of things at the commencement of and during the first few years of the Long Parliament may not be without its use to the present generation, especially to those who may cherish the desire for some few changes in the Book of Common Prayer.

In 1640, when the Long Parliament assembled, some few alterations only were required in the Liturgy, except by the extreme Puritans now become Presbyterians, by whom its total rejection as a popish idol was demanded, and the substitution of that new discipline, for which the Scots had long agitated, and which they had succeeded in erecting since the year 1638. Yet within a very few years the men who would have been satisfied with certain trivial alterations, in their zeal for the war against their sovereign

[1] Kennet's Register, 574.

readily sacrificed the Book of Common Prayer for the Directory. The circumstances are pregnant with warning. They proclaim the danger of tampering with settled institutions. The truth is, these men, who called themselves members of the Church of England, had no fixed principles in these matters, or they could not so easily have complied with the Scots, who refused to lend their aid in the war unless their own system of Church-government was adopted in England. The Prayer-book, therefore, was a part of the price for the assistance of the Scots. Nor should the circumstances of those times be forgotten by us; for though we are in no danger of civil commotions, yet it is possible for men who once begin to relinquish ancient customs, to concede one thing after another, until nothing is left to be conceded. After twenty years' misery, the people of England, who had not been consulted at the commencement of the troubles, when it was rejected, gladly welcomed back the Common Prayer. It is a singular fact, that very few of the people comparatively objected to the use of the book on the king's return. The objectors were chiefly among the ministers who had rejected the book, and wished to keep it out of the churches.

The sad and distracted state of religion during those twenty years of trouble, from 1648 to 1660, is well known; and when, subsequent to the restoration, the parliamentary Directory was discarded for the Book of Common Prayer, the legacy of the Reformers to the English Church, the change was grateful to the mass of the people. During the confusions there was abundance of preaching, but very little social worship. Instead of joining with the minister in the service of the Church, as was the custom in all ages, the people were merely assembled to listen to a sermon and a formal prayer from the preacher. They were spectators of a scene, not participators in an act of public worship, according to the method adopted by the Reformers from the practice of the primitive Church. Yet, under the reign of the Presbyterians, with the Directory in the

room of the Liturgy, we meet with a most unequivocal confession from the ruling powers of the inefficiency of their scheme to meet the spiritual wants of the people. Thus these enemies to all forms actually published one by their own authority for the use of the sailors. It furnishes one of the strongest testimonies to the adaptation of the Book of Common Prayer to the circumstances of the people. This Presbyterian form is one of the most singular publications of that extraordinary period. It is called *A Supply of Prayer for the Ships that want Ministers to pray with them.*

"A reason of this work" is prefixed to the book; and it states: "whereas there are thousands of ships which have not ministers with them to guide them in prayer, and therefore either use the old form of Common Prayer, or no prayer at all; the former whereof for many weighty reasons hath been abolished, and the latter is likely to make them rather heathens than Christians. Therefore, to avoid these inconveniences, it hath been thought fit to frame some prayers, agreeing with the Directory established by parliament." There are certain directions for the use of the form. The first is: "the company being assembled, they may thus begin with prayer." A short prayer follows, after which the Lord's prayer was to be used, and we have this direction, "After this some psalms and chapters being read out of both Testaments (but none out of those books called Apocrypha), and a psalm being sung, a prayer may follow in this manner." Two prayers follow, one being "for the Church universall, and our united Churches and kingdoms." In the latter we find this petition: "We pray thee send thy blessing upon all the reformed Churches, especially upon the Churches and kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, now more strictly and religiously united in the solemne league and covenant." Another is, "heal our rents and divisions, and preserve us from breach of our solemn covenant." Yet the covenant was the fruitful source of their divisions. It

contains also a petition for the king, though at the very time they were making war upon him; so that the soldiers, sailors, and people were by this form taught to be hypocrites. "We pray thee for all in authority, especially for the king's majesty, that God would make him rich in blessings both in his person and government, establish his throne in religion, save him from evil counsel, and make him a blessed and glorious instrument for the conservation and propagation of the gospel." Yet the men by whom this prayer was set forth were labouring to subdue the king and to subvert the throne. Next comes a direction, "After this prayer a psalm may be sung, and the conclusion may be with a thanksgiving and blessing." Then follows "a prayer particularly fitted for those that travell upon the seas," and "a prayer in a storm."

The whole form is exceedingly curious, as emanating from men who pretended that all forms were unlawful; for this was the doctrine of the Scots and all the Presbyterians of that day. How this form was received we cannot ascertain; but it remains as an evidence of the inconsistency of men who were constrained to put forth a prescribed service in order to supersede the use of the Book of Common Prayer among sailors and traders.[m] In those ships in which any appearance of religion was preserved, the Book of Common Prayer, notwithstanding the parliamentary ordinances, was used by the sailors; and this strange production was put forth in order that the book, which was evidently valued by the common people as well as by the upper classes, might be altogether set aside. This is admitted in the preface to the form; for they state that the sailors either used the Book of Common Prayer or neglected prayer altogether.

Yet the members of the Long Parliament were at first

[m] A Supply of Prayer for the Ships of this kingdom that want Ministers to pray with them, agreeable to the Directory established by Parliament. Published by authority. London, printed for John Field, and are to be sold at his house upon Addle-Hill, 4to. It is without date.

avowed friends of the Church of England, advocates of the Liturgy and episcopal government. Under this impression they were addressed by Bishop Hall soon after their first meeting. "The Liturgie of the Church of England hath been hitherto esteemed sacred; reverently used by holy martyrs; daily frequented by devout Protestants, as that which more than once hath been allowed and confirmed by the edicts of religious princes, and by your own parliamentary acts; yet now begins to complain of scorn: the matter is quarrelled at by some, the forme by others, the use of it by both."[n] This production, written by one of the best of men, and intended as a defence of the established Liturgy, raised a host of enemies. It was answered by five individuals, under the name of *Smectymnuus*—a word compounded of their initial letters—all of them ministers of the English Church, to whose Articles and Liturgy they had all professed their adherence. Yet thus early, in the year 1641, they put forth principles which were subversive of the doctrine of the Church of England. Though they had subscribed to the Book of Common Prayer, yet now they boldly charge it with popery. Their answer called forth a defence from Hall, which must have stung them to the very quick, had they retained any sense of shame. "Fie, brethren, are ye presbyters of the Church of England, and dare challenge episcopacie of faction?"[o] In reply to Hall's assertion that the Liturgy had been held sacred by martyrs, these cavillers ask, "Whence then proceed so many additions and alterations that have changed the face and fabricke thereof?" To which Hall replies: "Additions and alterations? What! in the present Liturgy? Where or what? Tell me, I beseech you, brethren, are they visible, or are they not? Perhaps somewhere, instead of *priest* there is *minister;* perhaps

[n] An Humble Remonstrance to the high Court of Parliament, by a dutifull Sonne of the Church: London, 1640, pp. 9, 10.

[o] A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against the frivolous and false exceptions of Smectymnuus: London, 1641, p. 7.

absolution is interpreted by a *remission;* perhaps in private baptisme there is mention of a *lawful minister;* perhaps instead of *purification of women* there is *thanksgiving;* and can ye know the book when ye see it againe, after these alterations, these additions? And why should not I speak of martyrs, as the authors and users of this holy Liturgy? Why should not we glory in their name and authority? Sleight you them as you please, we blesse God for such patrons of our good cause." To the charge of symbolising with the mass, Hall says: "Surely neither as masse nor as popish; if an holy prayer be found in a Roman portuise, shall I hate it for the place? If I find gold in the channell, shall I throw it away because it was ill laid?" To their objection of a difference between the Prayer-book and "the Liturgies of all other reformed Churches," Hall asks, "Whose fault is that? Ours was before theirs: why did not they conforme to us, rather than we come backe to them? I may boldly say ours was and is the more noble Church, and therefore more fit to lead than to follow; but, indeed, since our languages and regions are different, what need is there our Liturgies should be one?"[p] It may be remarked, that this objection relative to the differences between the Book of Common Prayer and the Liturgies of foreign reformed Churches was constantly alleged by the men who laboured to procure alterations; but it is a singular fact, that, when the English book was rejected, all other forms were rejected with it. Nay, the reformed Churches, with perhaps the exception of the Lutheran, have discarded their own Liturgies. The Church of Scotland uses no form whatever, though formerly one was sanctioned. It seems to be an inherent principle in Presbytery and Independency to reject all forms. So, after 1640, the men who talked of the Liturgies of other Churches as a model for England rejected all. They had formerly pleaded for

[p] A Defence, &c. 9, 24, 26.

liberty in some few things, professing themselves to be friends to episcopacy and the Common Prayer, and yet both were soon rejected as sinful and burdensome.

Let the scenes witnessed in England upon the abolition of episcopacy and the Prayer-book be a warning to the present age not to listen to any proposals for changes. There are some few men who call themselves members of the Church of England, and yet talk of the *popery of the Prayer-book*, and call for another reformation. Let all who love the Church be on their guard against objections, however plausibly urged; remembering that any material changes would involve a renunciation of the Reformation. In the times to which we have alluded, many persons began life as members of the Church of England, then they became Presbyterians, and afterwards Independents, simply from listening and yielding to a few leaders, whose hatred of the Prayer-book and episcopacy was manifest from the beginning. In the year 1641 the House of Commons, though nominally churchmen, made several orders against bishops, even allowing ordination by presbyters, and adjoining laymen with clergymen to set up Church government. In June they voted that "there should be no archbishops, bishops, &c., within this Churche and kingdome." In July it was voted, "that there should be severall select committees of the clergy appointed for the ordination of clergymen into the ministery. And there was then a great debate about the said bill in giving reasons, wherefore the laytie should be joyned in commission with the clergy; and it was then again voted that ecclesiasticall jurisdiction shall be transferred to commissioners, as it was before voted." Again, "that if any came to take orders, these commissioners to appoint five clergymen to grant ordinations." Within a very brief space the Book of Common Prayer was attacked by these nominal churchmen. On the 1st of August a proposal for altering the Liturgy was submitted to the House of Commons, which was supported by more than sixty; but being opposed by

fifty-five, the question was deferred to another day. On the 6th the same subject was again debated. Williams's form has already been mentioned, as well as the odium to which he was subjected in consequence. The following is the notice in *the Diurnal Occurrences:* "Tuesday (the 7th of August) was the day of thanksgiving for the happy pacification; but the members of the house solemnised it, not at St. Margaret's, Westminster, as was appointed, by reason that the Bishop of Lincoln has caused a set form of prayer to be printed and used in the Church for the thanksgiving; wherefore it was kept by them at Lincoln's Inne." On September 9th this year the lords drew up an order enforcing the use of the Common Prayer, and sent it to the Commons for their concurrence, who, however, refused their assent, and it was printed by the authority of the upper house only.[q] All these proceedings occurred while the House of Commons professed themselves to be members of the Church of England; yet they began with alterations, and then soon rejected the book altogether. Let the new reformers begin to alter the book in some few things, and other and bolder men will proceed to effect its complete rejection. Much clamour was raised against the bishops at this time for enforcing conformity; and from the proceedings in parliament it is evident that some of the clergy had been most inconsistent in their conduct, so that their diocesans were compelled to act. Thus one of the charges against Wren was, that in the year 1637 he enjoined that divine service should not be performed in a certain church until a surplice was provided. The minister wished to officiate without the surplice, contrary to law, and pleaded that the parish had not provided one. Could Wren, or any other bishop, have pursued a different course? yet the House of Commons, in 1641, though they called themselves church-

[q] Diurnal Occurrences, or the Heads of the Proceedings of both Houses of Parliament, from the third of November, 1640, to the ninth of September, anno 1641, 4to. See under the above-mentioned dates.

men, entertained the articles of impeachment, among which was the above, with many others equally absurd.[r]

It behoves us, in these times of excitement, to consider the example of the men who, after objecting to a few things in the Book of Common Prayer, rejected it altogether. Let the reformers of the present day be reminded of the conduct of the Puritans in successive reigns, until the Church was overturned. They began their career by opposing the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and then laboured to impose their own Prayer-book upon the whole nation. Yet their Book of Common Prayer was frequently altered, though each edition had been pronounced perfect. After contending for their Book of Common Prayer, even this production, though perfect and complete, was rejected. At the commencement of the troubles in the year 1640 the Liturgy was merely to be altered; but within a very brief space it was set aside as popish by men, who at first only called for a revision. Should the Book of Common Prayer be again subjected to revision, except for the simple purposes already stated in this volume, the whole Liturgy would be endangered. The Puritan book of discipline also was subjected to many revisions, though each was regarded as the identical platform established by Jehovah for the government of his Church. "The Articles of our religion (concluded upon by the clergie of our Church), with these learned and all-seeing brethren, are but the bishops' decrees, the articles of the convocation-house, and reveale some little truth; but these wise brethren, they have not failed to shew us

[r] Diurnal Occurrences, &c. p. 302.

[s] Rogers on the XXXIX. Articles, &c. ed. 1607, 4to, preface. Rogers has a marginal note on the above extract. "The Br. renue and continue their base conceits of the publike art. of our religion in comparison of their new gospell." It may be remarked on the above extract, that Rogers, who lived so near the time, asserts that the Articles were framed in and sanctioned by the convocation. This he asserts in several parts of his work, the first edition of which was published in the year 1586. It is also worthy of remark, that he gives, both in 1586 and 1607, the clause on the power of the Church

the whole counsaill of God."[s] Each book, as it came forth, was different from its predecessor, while all in succession were called perfect. "In 1572 the first admonition was offered, as contayning a perfect platforme of the discipline they desired to be established. Within fewe years after they altered it againe; in the year 1584 another, which seemed to have received as much perfection as they could desire; but presently after the parliament this was found amongst them to have some things amisse, and the correcting being referred to one who had traversed the matter anew, it came out more perfect in the yeare 1586, another in the yeare 1588."[t] Is it not also evident that those

in the 20th Article, and defends the doctrine against certain adversaries, without even any allusion to the dispute; from which it is evident that in his day, or from 1586 to 1607, there had been no controversy respecting its genuineness. Had not the clause been general in the editions of that period, he would have entered upon the question. His silence is a proof that it was then received as genuine.

[t] Covell's Modest and Reasonable Examination of some things in use in the Church of England, sundrie times heretofore misliked, &c. Lond. 1604, 4to, pp. 23, 24. Covell has been previously quoted on the subject of lay baptism; and though he so far allowed it in cases of necessity as not to approve of its repetition, yet he was extremely averse to the practice. Thus, in reply to the Puritan objection, "Baptism by women commanded and allowed," he says, "Nay, rather forbidden, and the action not allowed, though the act be. We are sorrie if any inconsiderately and presumptuously doe it; but, being done, wee hold a greater necessity of baptisme than that we dare think them fit to be baptised againe. Heerein if there bee any fault, surely it is not a fault in the Communion-booke." Ib. 190. The men of that age went no further than this; and their views do not support the doctrine of the Court of Arches respecting dissenting baptism. When this question was discussed at the Hampton Court Conference, it was asserted by the archbishop that the practice was not allowed by the Church; and the general conclusion was, that, when in cases of extreme necessity it was performed, it should not be repeated. The University of Oxford, in 1603, in answer to the millenary petition, say: "That the Church of England nor the Booke of Common Praier doth not prescribe that baptisme should be administered by women, though wee deny it not to be baptisme if perchance *de facto* it be by them administered. *Fieri non debuit, factum valuit.*" The Answere of the Vice-chancellors, the Doctors, both the Proctors, and other the Heads of Houses in the Universitie of Oxford, &c. to the humble Petition of the Ministers, &c. desiring Reformation, &c. At Oxford, 1603, 4to, p. 10.

clergymen who wish for a revision of our Liturgy, on the ground, as they allege, that some things are popish, would, were they indulged in their fancies, proceed step by step until the Book of Common Prayer would be quite laid aside? If such men value the Reformation, it behoves them not to speak lightly of the Book of Common Prayer, which is the precious legacy of our reformers to succeeding ages. If, in their consciences, they deem any portions of our Liturgy to be unwarranted by Holy Scripture, it is their obvious duty to maintain their consistency by quitting the Church of England. To object to her services, and yet continue to use them, is manifestly dishonest.

With respect to the Articles, no one would touch them. They were framed when the Church was restored to her primitive state, and the convocation would never alter what the Reformers established as matters of doctrine. Were an attempt to be made, the difficulty of deciding on the changes would soon lead to its relinquishment. Persons would be as widely at issue respecting alterations in the Articles as in the Liturgy; and the fear, should changes be attempted, of losing some things, which they would make great sacrifices to preserve, would compel all, except perhaps a few men of extreme opinions, to unite for their preservation in their integrity.

But though no serious change would be contemplated in the Liturgy, there are other matters which would necessarily occupy the attention of a convocation. For example, a revision of our canons. Several of them are set aside by special acts of parliament; others are superseded by the rubrics. Now, it would be desirable to revise the whole, and to omit all such as are repealed either by the laws of the land or the rubrics. They might be reduced within a smaller compass. So, whenever new statutes of an ecclesiastical character are required, they might be framed in convocation, which is certainly the proper place. The sanction of parliament could afterwards be obtained; and as the convocation would never

interfere with any matters which were not strictly ecclesiastical, the confirmation by the legislature would not be withheld. It is not unreasonable to ask that the Church should be permitted to make laws for her own government.[u]

The question of *psalmody* is one which would of necessity fall under the consideration of a convocation, were that assembly permitted to act, nor can it be settled in any other place. This is one of the points on which there is no uniformity in our churches, almost every congregation having a particular collection of psalms and hymns; so that while in all other parts of divine service uniformity is preserved, in singing there is less of it than even among the Dissenters. The question should not be permitted to continue in such a state. No one can consider it desirable that there should be such a variety in our practice. The Church has never settled the matter, and therefore each clergyman settles it for himself. But were the convocation to meet for business, this is one of the first subjects to which their attention would be directed. It would not be possible to avoid it. Nor would it be attended with much difficulty. A committee would be appointed to select, arrange, and prepare a book for general use in our churches. When thus prepared, it would be submitted to the whole convocation, and must pass both houses; so that in going through such an ordeal, there would be a very reasonable hope of obtaining an unobjectionable collection. It would then be duly authorised, and the clergy would be restrained from using

[u] "No instance can be given of the use of one body of canons in any national Church for one hundred and forty years without any synodical reform, except in this Church; and therefore, how perfect soever the system of canons was in 1603, yet whatever is variable in the state of the Church may be presumed to have varied within this period in some degree." Reynolds's Essay, 232. If this argument had any force when Reynolds wrote, it possesses still greater now. Canons for government, unlike articles of faith, which are unalterable, because the doctrines of the Gospel must ever remain the same, may be changed according to the circumstances of the Church.

any other book, or any other psalms and hymns. Thus our reproach would be wiped away, and the great principle of uniformity would be maintained.

This want of uniformity has often been expressed by individuals. In the year 1698 Luke Milbourne published a version of the psalms, which he dedicated to the archbishops, bishops, and clergy, "especially such as now do, or hereafter may, represent that whole body in convocation." The version of Sternhold and Hopkins was never authorised by the Church; neither is there any positive evidence that it ever received the sanction of the queen in council, though some presumptive proofs may be alleged. "Nor could I ever," says Milbourne, "find any authentic allowance for singing them in public, whatsoever the Company of Stationers pretend to, whose plausible title had a regard to their own profit, more than the Church's edification."

He alludes also to the fact, that no other version was duly authorised: "Since our convocations, to whom that work properly belongs, never took any such cognisance of the ancient versions as to recommend them with the Liturgy, our common psalmody remains a matter of liberty." "If it be a part of divine service, how comes it to pass that our ecclesiastical representatives have not thought uniformity in singing of psalms as beautiful and as valuable as in any other part of the public service? Why not in the *poetical* as well as in the *prose* version? And though it might seem a very hard work, which few of the clergy durst undertake, yet, since at this time there are several versions of the psalms extant, why may not some one, or a choice collection out of all, be made by learned and judicious persons, appointed for that purpose in a convocation?" After stating some particulars as to the mode of accomplishing the work, he says, "And may not these, after such an examination, be approved by the convocation, as the whole Liturgy formerly was?" He then remarks, that it is such a point of uniformity, that all

Churches except our own concur in it; instancing the Scotch, the French, and the Dutch.[u] The only authority possessed by any version of psalms is that of the king in council; an authority, however, which cannot be proved to have been granted to the version of Sternhold and Hopkins. Several versions have indeed at various periods been thus sanctioned; but none of them, with the exception of that by Tate and Brady, are now used in our churches. On every account it is desirable that the question should be settled in convocation, and that the singular variety observable in our churches should no longer continue.

Though no evidence, however, of the sanction of the privy council has been discovered, yet it is clear that the old version was supposed to be authorised by the queen's injunctions. In some of the early editions, the title states that the book was "allowed according to the queen's majestie's injunctions;" and in all copies the psalms are said to be set forth by authority. A psalm or hymn is mentioned in the royal injunctions, and on this ground an allowance is pleaded for this version. Besides, no objection was ever raised against their authority in any of the convocations. This argument is used by Beveridge, who contends, that as the convocations knew that they were used in every church in the kingdom, they, in abstaining from censure, "have approved of this translation."[v] The argument is a fair one, and it applies with equal force to the new version, since the convocation never expressed any disapprobation. Of Sternhold and Hopkins many

[u] The Psalms of David in English Metre, translated from the original by Luke Milbourne, a Presbyter of the Church of England: London, 1698.

[v] Beveridge's Defence of the Psalms, &c. 12mo, p. 91. Beveridge contended that the royal authority had been granted, or that the Company of Stationers would have been called to account for the title; but this argument is not worth much; for since the early copies issued by the queen's printers ad affirmed the royal allowance, the company might presume that they were duly authorised; or, at all events, they could be under no apprehension of being called to account.

editions were published during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, by the royal printers, and in subsequent reigns by the Company of Stationers; and that their authority, whatever it may have been, was deemed sufficient, is evident from the Visitation Articles put forth at different periods. In some articles in the year 1590, which is the earliest period at which I have met with the notice, though probably it may be found in others of a prior date, it is asked, whether they have in their churches "the Book of Common Prayer, and two Psalters in prose and meeter?"[w] Two psalters are mentioned in injunctions of earlier date, though it is not stated that one was to be the metrical version; yet it is probable that such was the case.[x] Thus we find proofs that the version of Sternhold and Hopkins was required by ecclesiastical authority to be placed in churches in the reign of Elizabeth.

This version was in high favour with the Puritans in the reigns of James I. and Charles I., though it was partially superseded after the civil wars by another. One of the charges alleged against Cosin by Peter Smart was that of disparaging and discouraging the metrical psalms. Cosin replied, that so far from discouraging their use, he had always joined with the congregation in singing them in the church.[y]

But though so favoured by the earlier Puritans, this translation fell somewhat into disrepute under the Long Parliament, by whom it was discarded, as being *uncouth and unsuited to the times,* and Barton's version was accordingly ordered to be substituted in its place. At all events,

[w] Articles ministred in the Visitation of the Right Worshipfull Maister John King, Archdeacon of Nottingham, in the year of our Lord God 1599. Printed at Oxford by Joseph Barnes, printer to the Universitie.

[x] They are mentioned in the Visitation of the Bishop of London, 1577; of the Archdeacon of Middlesex, 1582; of the Bishop of Coventrie, 1584; of the Archdeacon of Surrey, 1621 and 1629; and of the Bishop of Gloucester, 1629.

[y] An Illustration of Mr. Daniel Heal's History of the Puritans in the article of Peter Smart, 1736, 8vo; Heylin's Examen, 284.

this book was recommended for public use, though probably its reception was by no means general.[z] As late as the year 1655, however, it is evident that the old book still maintained its place in the affections of the people, for we find Richard Baxter recommending Barton's version. In his suggestions to the parliament of that period, Baxter says, "Seeing our common version of the psalms in meeter is so faulty that it is not fit to be continued, when better may be had; and those that lay them by do use some one, some another, when concord in such a work is so desirable among the churches; we humbly move that you would recommend some one of the best unto all churches in the land. Might I presume to speak my thoughts, that version, which being first approved of by the late assembly of divines, and after very much corrected and bettered in Scotland, and now approved by their assembly, and used generally by their churches, is the best that is extant, and fittest in many respects to be recommended. But if so great a preparation to unanimous reception satisfie not, you may authorise the ministers of the province of London to appoint a committee of skillfull men to draw one version out of all, or to try and judge of the best that is already extant."[a]

[z] The Book of Psalms in Metre, lately translated, with many wholesome and choice Collections added, &c. Printed by order of the Parliament; and now much augmented and amended with the cream and flower of the best Authors, &c. With the approbation of more than fourty eminent Divines of the city, and most of them of the Assembly. By William Barton, M. of Arts. London, 1645, 12mo. The first edition was published in 1644. In a preface to a volume of hymns by the author's son, published after the Restoration, it is said: "Finding withal that the ancient usage of our speech in Sternhold and Hopkins' translation was become obsoletely contemptible to many people of his age," he produced his new version. Barton conformed at the Restoration, and died in 1678.

[a] Humble Advice; or, the Heads of those Things which were offered to many honourable Members of Parliament by Richard Baxter at the end of his Sermon, Dec. 24th, at the Abbey in Westminster. With some Additions, as they were delivered by him to a Friend, &c. London, 1655, 4to, p. 6. Baxter in this work uses an argument for the meeting of ministers which

It is remarkable that Baxter could press uniformity in singing, while he was content to leave every man at liberty in public prayer. We gather also, from the above extract, that Barton's version was not generally used, though it had been sanctioned by the assembly of divines. Alterations were the order of the day in those miserable times in every part of public worship. Thus, after the sanction of the Westminster Assembly to Barton's version, the Scotch must alter it for themselves. In short, nothing was fixed. All things continued in a state of confusion until the Restoration, when Barton's version was no more heard of in England, and the people returned to that of Sternhold and Hopkins, which kept its place in the Church until the close of the century.

The Act of Parliament for the observance of the 29th of May mentions the singing of psalms; and as no other version was used by churchmen, that by Sternhold and Hopkins must have been intended. So far, therefore, its use is sanctioned by the legislature.

When the old version was in the highest repute with the Puritans, or Presbyterians, some of the clergy endeavoured to disparage it, and would willingly have excluded it from their churches. This was the case with Heylin, who dwells on its supposed want of authority, arguing that it was merely permitted, not imposed. His opinion, or assertion, was founded on the absence of the document from the privy council. He complains that these psalms, in many churches, had thrust out the *Te Deum*, the *Benedictus*, the *Magnificat*, and the *Nunc di-*

should be considered by the opponents of convocation, since it is as applicable to our circumstances as to those of the year 1653. "We beseech you fail not to secure to us by law, and to recommend the free use of ministerial assemblies; which, whether necessary or not for regiment, are certainly so necessary for unity, that we cannot carry on God's work in concord well without them. This most confesse. Deny us not that the Church enjoyed under heathen princes, and hath used in the apostles' daies (Acts xv. &c.), and ever since to this day." Ib. 3. This was addressed to an usurping parliament.

mittis. His meaning must have been, that these hymns were only read, and not chanted; for we cannot suppose that they were altogether disused. We gather incidentally from Heylin's account, that a most irreverent mode prevailed among the people during the celebration of divine service. Thus, during the reading of the prose psalms and the lessons, the men, in some churches, were accustomed to sit with their heads covered, while all uncovered themselves while the metrical psalms were sung, though they still kept their seats.[b] Cosin asserted that the psalms were appended to the Prayer-book by the Company of Stationers, "either by their own private ordinances, or by some order from the privy council in Queen Elizabeth's time. Authority of convocation or of parliament (such as our Liturgy had) never had they any; only the queen, by her letters patent to the stationers, gave leave to have them printed, and allowed (did not command) them to be sung in churches. No bishop ever inquired of their observance."[c]

[b] Heylin's Eccles. Res. 131; History of the Presbyterians, 248, 249.

[c] The Right Reverend Doctor John Cosin, late Lord Bishop of Durham, his opinion (when Dean of Peterburgh and in exile), for communicating rather with Geneva than with Rome. Also, what slender Authority, if any, the English Psalms in rhime and metre have ever had for the publick use they have obtained in our churches: freely rendered in two Letters, with Annotations on the said Letters, &c. by Ri. Watson, D.D. London, 1684, pp. 13, 14. Cosin, and other clergymen, who went into exile to avoid the rage of the Long Parliament, were exposed to the charge of popery at home, while they were acting consistently with the Church of England abroad. In the year 1651 Evelyn met him at Paris. He gave Evelyn an account of the publication of his Devotions, which were prepared and published by command of Charles I. The book was compiled from the Orarium of 1560, put forth by authority of Queen Elizabeth. "This I rather mention to justify that industrious and pious dean, who had exceedingly suffered by it, as if he had done it of his owne head to introduce popery, from which no man was more averse, and one who in this time of temptation and apostacy held and confirmed many to our Church." Evelyn, ii. 41, 42. "During his residence in this place he shewed how false and groundless was the imputation that had been thrown upon him of being popishly affected; for, notwithstanding his great straits, he remained steady and unmoved in the profession of the Protestant religion. He kept up the

In 1696 the version of Tate and Brady was authorised by the king in council for public use, and recommended to such places as were willing to receive it. For many years a struggle existed between the two versions; nor did the more recent triumph over the more ancient version until a comparatively late period. Subsequent to the Revolution, the old version was very much altered, though the author of the changes cannot be ascertained. By some persons it has been said, that the alterations were made by the ecclesiastical commission in 1689; but the statement rests on very questionable authority. It is more probable that they were effected some years later, when the new version was published, and by command of the Company of Stationers, who were jealous of the rival book. One of the reasons assigned for the publication of the version by Tate and Brady was the obsolete language of the old. To meet, or obviate this objection, the alterations were quietly made. Beveridge could give no account of the changes; a circumstance which may be regarded as conclusive against the opinion that they were made by the commissioners in 1689.[d]

English Church discipline, and the form of worship appointed by the Common Prayer; he reclaimed some that were quite gone over to popery, and confirmed several more in the Protestant profession, who, by their converse with Romanists, were become wavering. There were made him very great offers of preferment, if he would have been tempted thereby to alter his religion; but he stood proof against them all." Biog. Brit. art. Cosin; Nalson's Collections, i. 519. Fuller says: "Whilst he remained in France he was the Atlas of the Protestant religion, supporting the same with his piety and learning, confirming the wavering therein, yea, daily adding proselytes (not of the meanest rank) thereto." Fuller's Worthies, 295. His History of Popish Transubstantiation and his Scholastic History of the Canon of Holy Scripture are triumphant answers to the charge of Popery.

[d] Beveridge's Defence of the Psalms, &c. "Who was the author I know not, nor by what authority the Company of Stationers printed it so altered." "I never heard who made them, nor by what authority it was done, or whether by any authority." pp. 53, 81. Much opposition was offered in some places to the introduction of the new version. Beveridge wrote the above work expressly in its defence. He mentions a church in London in which the new version was introduced by the minister, and cast out by the

It will be seen from the extracts from Visitation Articles, that Cosin was mistaken in his assertion, that no bishop had "inquired of their observance." The two letters written by Cosin during his exile, on Communion with Geneva, and on the Psalms, were published by Watson many years after. Watson's feeling against the metrical version was so strong, that he discarded it from his church at the Restoration, greatly to the annoyance of his parishioners, and also in opposition to the wishes of his diocesan, Henchman, Bishop of Sarum. In his remarks on the letters of Cosin he enters into his case, and endeavours to defend his practice. Foreseeing a strong opposition from his parishioners, he tells us that he "meant to keep on the defensive side, secured by the rubrick, after my saying the Nicene Creed; then shall follow the sermon, &c., without the least mention of any psalm to be sung before my passing to the pulpit." Henchman was much annoyed, but yet did not issue any command; so that Watson persisted in his course. Under Henchman's successor, a proposal was made by the chancellor of the diocese, that the tithes of the parish should be peaceably paid, if "I would comply with my parishioners in these two particulars, 1st, singing the vulgar psalms as turned unto meeter; 2d, reading the Communion-service in the desk, and not go up into the chancel." Watson adopted a very singular, and not very honourable

vestry. Ib. 101. But even the new version has undergone various alterations since its first appearance; so that neither is used now in the form in which it was first authorised. A supplement, consisting of various hymns, was authorised by Queen Anne in 1703. Two instances will illustrate the alterations in the old version; the 12th stanza of psalm 74 in the old editions stands thus:

"Why dost thou draw thy hand aback,
And hide it in thy lap?
O pluck it out, and be not slack
To give thy foes a rap."

The 8th stanza in the 78th psalm commences as follows:

"What! is his goodness clean decaid,
For ever and a day?"

course upon this recommendation of the chancellor, which he mentions with apparent simplicity. He replied, that "if he would issue out from his court a countermand to my curate, and I found him influenced by it when I came down into the countrey (for we were then in London), I would not discontinue that practice my curate had entered on by his order, but leave the burthen of prætercanonical, or præterrubrical, acting in the offices of the Church on him who was better able to answer it than myself." He does not mention the result, though it appears from what follows that the chancellor did not interpose; for Watson, waiting on the bishop some time after, produced Cosin's letter in defence of his conduct. Cosin was then Bishop of Durham; and Earl, the Bishop of Sarum, replied, that his lordship's opinion about the use of the psalms was now different: "I am sure he is now of another mind in the particular of singing psalms." To this remark Watson replied, "I cannot help that, my lord, nor can I change the opinion I was confirmed in, chiefly by this authority under his own hand, until our Church doth change her rubrick, or I may be otherwise convinced. Soon after this, I departed fairly, and enjoyed my freedom."[e]

Watson endeavours to account for Cosin's change of opinion in the matter, on the supposition that he was anxious to indulge the Presbyterians "in his latter days, upon better hopes perhaps of a friendly accommodation in greater matters than hath been yet, or, in likelihood, ever will be effected."

[e] The Right Reverend Doctor John Cosin, late Lord Bishop of Durham, his Opinion, &c. 91, 98, 202. On another point Watson did not fully agree with Cosin. One of his letters relates to the foreign Protestant churches, especially to that of Geneva, which he regarded as defective in government from their want of episcopacy; yet he did not refuse to communicate with them, when he could not have the worship of the Church of England. The very title of Watson's book proves this; and in the letter Cosin assigns his reason for uniting with Geneva rather than with Rome: "It is far less safe to joyn with these men, that alter the *credenda*, the vitals of religion, than

It is singular that a bishop should have proposed to a clergyman to read the Communion-service in the desk, merely to gratify some of his parishioners, when the rubric is so express, and the custom had continued from the Reformation, except in those churches in which ministers inclined to the Puritan discipline were fixed previous to the Long Parliament, under whose rule the Prayer-book was set aside.

During the discussions between the two houses in the reign of Queen Anne a better tone was adopted by the prelates on the question of conformity to the rubrics and canons. In their *Observations* in 1704 on a Paper from the lower house, the bishops remark: "We shall be extreamly ready and desirous to assist our clergy in all doubts and difficulties of what kind soever; and as to the directions they pray concerning their refusal of the *holy sacrament* to unworthy persons, we can give them no surer nor better than they have in the rubrick before the Communion-service, which is confirmed by act of parliament. Nor (next the Holy Scriptures) can we give our clergy any better rule for their behaviour in general, than the rubricks and canons of our Church; being well assured that no one who observes them strictly and religiously can ever be wanting either in a dutiful regard to his superiors, or in a conscientious care of the flock, whereof those his superiors, under Christ, have appointed him the pastor and minister."[f]

It has been shewn in the preceding pages, that we have no authorised form for the consecration of churches.

with those that meddle only with the *agenda* and *rules* of religion, if they meddle no farther; and where it is not in our power to help it, there is no doubt but in these things God will accept the will for the deed. They of Geneva are to blame in many things, and defective in some; they shall never have my approbation of their doings: yet I do not see that they have set up any new articles of faith, under pain of damnation to all the world that will not receive them for such articles, and you know whose case that is." Ib. 3, 4.

[f] The Complainer further Reproved, &c. p. 25.

On two occasions a form has received the sanction of convocation, but still the business was not completed. It would be, therefore, a desirable work to prepare and authorise a service. The convocation might adopt that of 1712. At all events, it would be consistent that our bishops should not be left to their own discretion in this matter any more than in the other services which are peculiar to the episcopal office, such as *Confirmation* and the *Ordering of priests and deacons*. Undoubtedly it is a proper subject for the consideration of convocation.

Every one is aware of the difficulty, under present circumstances, of enforcing obedience to the rubrics and canons. It is well known that there are many deviations in practice which cannot be justified, but which are a violation of the engagements entered into by the clergy at their ordination. In the case of curates, indeed, the license may be withdrawn on any irregularity being made known to the bishop; but with incumbents there is much difficulty. Now it would be easy for the convocation to frame laws for the proper enforcement of obedience. A clergyman is pledged to comply with the directions of the Church as expressed in her liturgy. Those who deviate from the rule break a solemn engagement. They are dissenters without the honesty of dissenters, for they remain in the Church, and yet violate her rules. The observation will also apply to those who introduce practices not enjoined by the Church. A rule is laid down; and those who come not up to it are dissenters on one side, while those who go beyond it are dissenters on the other; or to adopt the language of Stillingfleet, "He is as much a dissenter from the Church of England who goes beyond that rule, as he who does not come up to it." The matter might easily be settled in convocation. Let rules be framed, and let powers be granted to the diocesan to enforce them; and those men who forget their solemn obligations, and alter or omit portions of the Liturgy, or change the appointed lessons, would soon be reduced to

conformity, when it became clear that the alternative must be *removal from their benefices.*

It is admitted on all hands, that as the Church is extended among our population, the number of bishops as well as of the clergy should be increased. If dioceses cannot conveniently be divided, the order of suffragan bishops might be revived with great advantage to the Church. By the law of the land, the bishop of any diocese may recommend two persons to the crown, and the crown may make the selection of one to act as his coadjutor. But as the order has long since fallen into disuse, it would be desirable that the whole matter should be submittted to convocation, with a view to the revival of the practice.

In ancient times there was an order of bishops called *chorepiscopi*, who acted as assistants or coadjutors to the bishops of dioceses. They were generally placed in the largest villages. Originally they were intended to supply the place of aged and infirm bishops, in conferring orders and in administering confirmation; but they had no jurisdiction, and could only act by a commission from the bishop of the diocese. They existed from the first Nicene Council to the middle of the ninth century, when the order was gradually abolished by the influence of the popes, who did not find the *chorepiscopi* disposed to promote their views of aggrandisement. Other persons were therefore invested with the same powers, though under the name of suffragans, who, in most cases, were appointed by the pope himself. Their duty was the same as that of the chorepiscopi, or bishops of the country; namely, to assist the diocesan in consecrating churches, in ordaining priests and deacons, and in supplying the place of the bishop on all occasions when, from various causes, he might be unable to be present.[g] A commission from the diocesan

[g] Lewis's Account of Suffragan Bishops, pp. 6, 29; Bingham, i. 181, 189; ib. iii. 183; Maurice's Diocesan Episcopacy, 402; Brett's Church

was necessary to authorise them to act, since, by the laws of the Church, no bishop can perform any episcopal act in the see of another without permission. In England it appears that the order of *suffragan* bishops was instituted in the time of William the Conqueror; and until the reign of Henry VIII. they were usually appointed by the pope. Originally they took their titles from places *in partibus infidelium*, that is, places where the bishops could not remain with safety, though there were fixed sees in them. They were bishops at large, or titular bishops, but their office was identical with that of the *chorepiscopi*, though some of the duties of the latter were performed at a subsequent period by the bishop's chancellor. No change occurred until the 26th of Henry VIII., when an act was passed, by which suffragan bishops were permitted, under certain restrictions. The names of certain towns and villages were also specified, from which the suffragans were to derive their titles; so that they were now constituted *chorepiscopi* as formerly. On Queen Mary's accession the statute was repealed; but it was revived in the reign of Elizabeth.[h]

The following extracts from the Act of Parliament will shew the intention of those by whom it was framed. After specifying the places, the act declares that they "shall be taken and accepted for sees of bishops suffragans to be made in this realm, and the bishops of such sees shall be called suffragans of this realm. And that every archbishop

Government, pp. 215, 227-230; Nelson's Rights of the Clergy, 121; Anglia Sacra, i. 64; Godolphin's Repertorium, 31.

[h] The following places are specified in the act as the sees or residences of suffragans: — Bridgewater, Taunton, Bristol, Dover, Penrith, Shrewsbury, Berwick, Cambridge, St. Germains, Gloucester, Bedford, Grantham, Huntingdon, Leicester, Colchester, Ipswich, Thetford, Marlborough, Molton, Shaftesbury, Guildford, Southampton, Hull, Nottingham, and the Isle of Wight. Since that time Bristol and Gloucester have been created sees. Recently, however, they have been united; so that by the act in question, reckoning Bristol and Gloucester, there are twenty-four places in which suffragan bishops may be appointed. Johnson's Vade Mecum, i. 48, 49.

and bishop, being disposed to have any suffragans, shall and may at their liberties name and elect, every one of them, for their peculiar diocese, two honest and discreet spiritual persons, and those two persons, so by them to be named, shall present to the king's highness, making humble request to his majesty, to give to one such of the said two persons as shall please his majesty, such title, name, style, and dignity of bishop of such of the sees above specified, as the king's highness shall think most convenient for the same." It is added, "and that every such person shall be called bishop suffragan of the same see whereunto he shall be named." The act further provides for his consecration by the archbishop of the province in the ordinary way. In order that no inconvenience might arise in the exercise of episcopal authority, and to prevent strife or jealousy, it was ordered, that the suffragan should not exercise any jurisdiction, except with the consent and by the appointment of the diocesan. Nor was the authority to be exercised longer than was permitted by the bishop.[1]

From the above extracts it is clear that the king was at liberty to give the suffragan any one of the titles mentioned in the act, without being confined to places within the diocese in which he was to exercise authority. Thus the Bishop of London had a suffragan at that time with the title of suffragan of Bedford. Still the more general practice was to grant a title from a place in the diocese.

It is obvious that the order might be revived with great advantage to the Church; and it is clear from the act by which suffragans are authorised, that no possible inconvenience or discomfort could arise to the diocesan, seeing that all the authority is vested in himself. The subject, therefore, is one which might be submitted to convocation; for though the act of parliament authorises the appointment, yet as more than three centuries have elapsed since it was enacted, and more than two since any suffragan was appointed, there are necessarily many matters which it

[1] Gibson's Codex, 134-136.

might be desirable to review. If only one were appointed in each diocese, what incalculable good might result to the Church! The suffragan might also perform those duties which are now discharged by the chancellor of the diocese. The office is fully recognised by the canons of 1604, for it is appointed by the 60th that "every bishop or his suffragan do in his own person carefully perform the office of confirmation;" and Charles II., in his declaration in 1660, says, "because the dioceses be thought to be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of suffragan bishops in every diocese as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work."[j] It would be easy to constitute suffragans wherever they might be required; and as the individuals selected for the office would not be expected to live in a style beyond that of ordinary clergymen, the additional expenses incurred by travelling would be comparatively small. At all events the suffragan might be permitted to hold a second living, with a view to the defraying of the necessary expense; or a stall, or some preferment in each cathedral might be devoted to that purpose. These and similar points might be considered in convocation, who would devote to them that attention which their importance and the circumstances of the Church require. "Now suffragans would go a great way towards a redress of the grievance; each of the present bishops would then be a sort of archbishop; and our two archbishops would then be patriarchs. The large extent of our dioceess could no longer be then complained of; nor the incapacity, which the bishop thence lies under, of acquainting himself much either with his clergy or his people."[k]

It may be mentioned that, according to Wharton, twenty-eight suffragan bishops were appointed in the diocese of London alone between the year 1312 and the period of the passing of the act of King Henry VIII. In the reign of

[j] The 35th canon mentions suffragans in reference to holy orders; and in the 135th they are alluded to in connexion with fees.

[k] Penitential Discipline, 245.

Elizabeth we meet with several, and one in that of James I.; since which time the office has fallen into disuse. To revive it would be perfectly easy; and to enable the convocation to make the necessary alterations in the machinery by which suffragans are appointed requires only the permission of the crown.[1]

A distinction, it will be seen, must be made between the order of suffragan bishops, of which we have been speaking, and the suffragans of the two archbishops; for all the bishops of a province are the suffragans of the metropolitan. In ancient times, the bishops met in council at the command of the archbishop, whose suffragans they were called, because they met by his appointment to give their vote or suffrage.

In some cases it may be desirable that dioceses should be divided. Not a few of them are of very large extent, —so large, or so populous, that no single bishop can possibly superintend them as they should be superintended. Visitations and confirmations must be held frequently, if the intercourse between the bishop and his flock is to be kept up; and in the latter case, it would be well if the youth of every parish could be confirmed in their own church. This is impracticable under the present system; yet nothing would tend more to advance the interests of

[1] Gibson's Codex, 134-137, 1335-1338; Grey's Ecclesiastical Law, 39, 40; Nelson's Rights of the Clergy, 121-123; Barlow's Remains, 160; Brett's Account of Church Government, ch. xii. second edition. The whole chapter in Brett is most valuable. Brokesby's Primitive Church, 201-216. Henry Wharton has left a Ms. list of nearly 300 suffragans in England. They appear to have been regularly appointed in almost every diocese. Specimen of Errors, 36; Anglia Sacra, i. 577, 790. "From the latter end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century down to the Reformation our histories are full with their names and office; and there is scarce a register in any bishop's office that does not afford us light enough to ascertain the names and the powers of their suffragan bishops." Lewis's Account, p. 7. It appears that the archbishop could compel a bishop to select a suffragan when any urgent cause existed. Thus Archbishop Peckham required the Bishop of Lichfield to provide a suffragan on account of his infirmities. Gibson.

the Church, than the presence of the bishop every year, or every second year, according to the amount of population, in every parish. The object may be attained either by the appointment of suffragans, or by the division of dioceses. Were a diocese to be divided under present circumstances, the arrangements would be carried into effect by the ecclesiastical commissioners; but without implying any reflection on that body, I must contend, that all such matters should be arranged in convocation. This plan could be adopted with the permission of the crown.

On the question of the division of dioceses and the appointment of suffragans, the following remarks, from an eminent writer of the last century, are worthy of our attention. Alluding to certain questions discussed in convocation, in the early part of the last century, relative to excommunication and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, he remarks, "It is evident, at first sight, how greatly the establishment of these two points would improve and invigorate the discipline of the Church; but it is as evident that we must not hope to see, either the discipline or the government of our Church in a complete and perfect state, as long as the several districts to be inspected and visited remain, in many instances, so unreasonably large. A just sense of which evil has made it the wish of wise and good men, that a further division of dioceses, in places where it shall be found necessary, were seriously attempted and entered upon; and if this remedy, however, the most natural and most effectual, is not to be obtained, that the evil might be at least mitigated by the appointment of suffragan bishops, according to the statute of King Henry VIII., which still remains in its full force and authority."[m]

[m] Gibson's Visitation Charges, pref. xi. xii. Elsewhere the same learned author observes: "The act being still in force as much as ever, and having so effectually restrained suffragans from any possibility almost of encroaching upon their bishops, or being uneasy to them, and the institution being of such evident use in large dioceses, and under infirm and aged bishops, especially for the work of confirmation, it is humbly referred to the wisdom of

It seems to be admitted that an increase in the number of our bishops is necessary for the welfare of the Church; and an order of suffragans, who could perform all episcopal acts, and would be free from parliamentary engagements, is recognised by the Church herself. Prior to the Reformation, suffragans were more numerous than they were subsequent to that great event. Still various instances occur in our history since that time. Cranmer was assisted by Thornden, as suffragan of Dover, in which post he continued until the year 1558. In the year 1568 Parker recommended John Rogers and John Butler to the queen, that one might be chosen as suffragan of Dover. The former was selected; and when Whitgift succeeded Grindal in the archbishopric, Rogers's commission was renewed. Rogers was allowed to exercise episcopal acts, not only in the diocese, but also in the province of Canterbury, so that it appears that the suffragan of an archbishop had more power conferred upon him than the suffragan of a bishop. Dr. Stern was suffragan of Colchester in the reign of James I., and was censured for not appearing in convocation in 1606.[n] The order, therefore, has at all times been recognised; it is allowed by act of parliament and also by convocation. Suffragans have often voted in the latter, and therefore it cannot be said that the ecclesiastical sanction is wanting.[o]

All these questions, and many others, which cannot be specified in this work, would be proper subjects for consideration with a convocation; and I conceive that the only appropriate place for their consideration would be a convocation. It would be easy for the crown to dictate to that body the subjects for discussion and settlement;

our governors to inquire for what causes they have been so long disused, and to consider how far the revival of them would be serviceable to the Church of Christ." Codex, 136. "Certainly chorepiscopi are now as requisite to assist the bishops of larger sees as curates are to assist the ministers of large parishes." Brett, 325.

[n] Gibson, 136; Strype's Cranmer, app.; Synod. Ang. 38; Brett, 247.

[o] Lewis, 12, 13; Todd's Deans of Canterbury; Brett, 247.

and as the law stands, no question could be settled without its concurrence. In short, the minister of the crown, who would of course consult the heads of the Church, would recommend such measures as the circumstances of the Church might require. The enemies of the Church not seldom reproach her as the creature of the State. Surely she ought to be permitted by the State to exercise that authority which of right belongs to her, and which was always, in all ages, recognised as her just privilege.

It is surely reasonable that those synodical rights which have not been exercised for more than a century should be restored. The convocation, however opposed to the views of any particular government, could not thwart its measures, since the crown has always the power in its own hands to adjourn or prorogue them, in fact to stop their proceedings altogether. In recommending this step, I do not mean to imply that the convocation should be permitted to transact business every session of parliament, but only when the circumstances of the Church demand it. Within the last twenty years many ecclesiastical measures have been carried into effect which were proper subjects for the convocation. Whenever any other ecclesiastical arrangements are necessary, it would be well that the minister of the crown should recommend a royal license to authorise the convocation to act. When settled in that assembly, they would be submitted to the crown; and in case the government deemed it necessary to suggest alterations or additions, the matter could be reconsidered in the ecclesiastical synod. Of course, I allude only to such questions as would fall appropriately under the cognisance of that body.

Let it be remembered also, that all questions affecting the welfare of the Church would receive the fullest consideration. No proposal could be carried into effect until it had been sanctioned by the two houses of convocation, and confirmed by the crown. It is most unlikely, therefore, that any measure would be carried which did

not commend itself to the judgment of unprejudiced men, as well amongst the laity as amongst the clergy. At all events, let the experiment be tried. Let the convocation be assembled; and let some subject be proposed for deliberation. The machinery is complete. Each diocese would send its proctors, who would be elected by the incumbents, so that the clergy of the land would be fairly represented. That they should have a voice in framing laws for the Church is only reasonable.

The revival of the powers of convocation would tend to the strengthening of our Church, and to the promotion of her usefulness among the people. Many plans would be recommended; much information would be procured; various schemes would be devised; and through the mutual intercourse between the bishops and clergy assembled in their convocation, the state of the Church in every parish might be fully ascertained. Were the archbishops, bishops, and clergy to express themselves in favour of a restoration of the powers of the convocation, I am convinced that their representation would be calmly and fully considered by her majesty's government. Unless, indeed, the bishops themselves call upon the government to act, it is not to be expected that any minister, of his own impulse, should venture to advise the crown on the subject; but let the archbishops, with the bishops of the kingdom, concur in an address to the throne on the subject, and it is certain that the boon would not be denied. Even should the experiment, as it is termed, fail, the remedy is with the crown; for, in the event of a collision between the two houses, which is most unlikely, or an attempt to carry measures which, in the estimation of the government, might be unadvisable, their labours might be suspended by a prorogation.

In earlier times, no party, whatever were their views, contemplated the possibility of proceeding without a convocation, in which Church matters could be discussed and settled. Even the Puritans required a national synod; and

at the commencement of the Long Parliament, the moderate churchmen, who merely advocated concessions on the ground of the indifferency of the things to which objections were raised, were anxious for the frequent meetings of convocation, and even to see it invested with more powers than it possesses under the Act of Submission. In a work published by some friends of the Church in 1640, when the storm in which she was so soon involved was ready to break forth, the writers say: "It is not unworthy your majestie's royal consideration, whether you should not think fit to give strength to the general council of your clergie, the convocation-house, which was then restrained, when the state of the clergie was thought a suspected part of the kingdom in regard of their late homage to the Bishop of Rome."[p] So in a most violent production of the same period, the lower clergy are represented as having no power, and as being led by the bishops. "In the lower house, the priests, parsons, and vicars, those clerks sit there to gaze one on another, and to tell the clocke, waiting for their lessons from their lords the prelates. There is no freedom of voices, they dare not consult among themselves, to promote the cause of Christ, and to reforme abuses. The better sort are overawed, so as they be made to consent unto the making of such canons as they would not, and these are thrust upon us as the constitutions of the Church of England, when it's nothing so, but of a strong faction of prelates and their adherents, who set them forth and obtrude them upon us unjustly." These were

[p] Certaine Considerations touching the better Pacification of the Church of England, 1640, 4to. This is a privately printed and an unpaged publication. Like the Puritans, the writer, though anxious to secure the Church, condemns private baptism. "For private baptism by women or lay persons the best divines do utterly condemn it." Still he was sensible of the extravagances of the Puritans. "As the extolling of the sacrament bred the superstition of the masse, the extolling of the Liturgie and prayers bred the superstition of the monastical orders; and so, no doubt, preaching likewise may be magnified and extolled superstitiously, as if all the whole body of God's worship should be turned into an eare."

the Church reformers of the day, yet even these men were advocates for a synod. "That a general assembly national be gathered once in three years to make canons, and establish ecclesiastical government."[q] Even the bitter opponents of the Church of England imagined that synodical action was necessary in some form or other for that system of ecclesiastical discipline which they were disposed to erect.[r]

The opponents of convocation appear to exercise their ingenuity in imagining difficulties. By some, changes in doctrine and practice are apprehended; yet no such thing could possibly occur, unless it were called for by a vast

[q] A short View of the prelatical Church of England, together with a short Draught of Church Government. Printed in the yeare 1641, pp. 31, 41, 4to.

[r] "Now if they be needful for the campe and for the congregation, as it is a civil body, I doubt not but I may adde also every way as needfull for the congregation properly so called, that is, the Church. The Church hath her wars to fight; the Church hath her lawes to make. Heresies have ever bin best put to flight by the Church's assemblies, that is, councils, as it were by the armies of God's angels (as Eusebius calleth them); yea, it is well known some heresies could never be throughly mastered or conquered but so. Therefore the Churches lawes (which we call canons and rules), made to restraine and redresse abuses, they have always likewise bene made at her assemblies or councils, and not elsewhere." Andrews concerning the Right of calling Assemblies, ed. 1606, 4to, pp. 10, 11. When Andrews wrote, the parliament was of one mind; at all events the members were churchmen. If, then, it was deemed improper at that time to decide Church matters in parliament, though churchmen alone were the legislators, the argument for a convocation is now much stronger, when the House of Commons is composed of Romanists, Socinians, and all other sects, who are the undisguised enemies of the Church of England. Yet most of the men who object to our services are ready to submit our Prayer-book to a parliamentary revision, imagining perhaps that just such portions would be expunged as would suit their own taste, and not seeing the danger of other alterations to which the liturgy would undoubtedly be subjected, should the question ever be submitted to that assembly. The men who look for changes can have no reverence for the memory of the Reformers. However, the feeling against all alterations, and in favour of preserving the Book of Common Prayer as well as the thirty-nine Articles untouched and unmutilated, has been proved to be so strong and so deeply seated both among the clergy and the people, that the persons, who a few years since openly talked of a revision, deem it prudent to keep silence, as well as to keep their preferments.

majority of the clergy; and in that case the crown or the legislature would interpose. We have already shewn that alterations of an extensive character would involve the condemnation of the Reformers, implying that those holy men were either destitute of spiritual discernment, or that they intentionally retained some things in the Prayer-book of which they did not cordially approve. Both these allegations have at various periods been put forth by different classes of objectors; yet they cannot consistently be adopted by men who have promised conformity to the rules of the Church, and whose obvious duty it is to comply, or to quit her communion. No sincere member of the Church of England could recommend such a course, inasmuch as he could not do so without censuring the men who arranged our Book of Common Prayer. "We may pretend to more art and learning than they had, but we cannot reach that strain of wisdom, piety, and devotion that runs through all their writings, especially such as were designed for the public service of God and his Church. And therefore we had need take care how we meddle with any thing that was done at that time."[s]

Such is Beveridge's caution. In a previous page, the persons who would seek for changes have been described as few in number, and the danger of their course has been pointed out. But really the individuals who object to the revival of convocation on the ground of alterations in the Prayer-book can scarcely be serious. Yet it has been asked, and with apparent earnestness, why any of the clergy should be forced to submit to novelties in doctrine or practice imposed by a small minority in the Church. Such an objection, however, confutes itself; since it will never be possible for a small minority, or any minority, to carry changes in convocation, unless the majority neglect their duty; consequently no danger could be apprehended, if the persons desiring alterations are few in number. It appears strange that such an objection should be gravely

[s] Beveridge's Defence of the Psalms, &c. p. 16.

urged. Unless an overwhelming majority in the Church were in favour of alterations, the proposal even could never be entertained, much less carried.

The only persons who have avowed a desire for alterations in the Prayer-book are those who talk of its popish character; and assuredly such objectors would never be able even to obtain a hearing in convocation. Besides, these objectors are more disposed to look to parliament, or to a royal commission, to obtain their end, than a convocation.

It is asserted by some persons, that the majority of the clergy are opposed to the revival of convocation; and this assertion is put forth as an argument on the subject. The obvious reply to such a statement is this, that if it be true, the majority will shew itself in convocation, and very soon end the business by coming to a vote on the subject, in the form of an address to the crown against synodical action. This is a point on which assertions need not be hazarded, since it may easily be decided whenever convocation assembles; and those who use the argument should endeavour to bring the matter to an issue by exerting their influence in the election of proctors, in order that their assertions may be tested. Should they be proved to be correct, the matter will end, and they will have the credit of getting rid of a troublesome business.

By another class of objectors difficulties are alleged with respect to the two provinces, the Irish Church and our colonial dioceses. Yet it is scarcely possible to believe that these objections are seriously alleged. The province of York can act as on many previous occasions, either in their own synod or by sending proxies to the province of Canterbury, or meeting in London in conjunction with the rest of the bishops and clergy in one national council. The assertion of a difference of constitution in the two provinces is erroneous; and the mistake has arisen from the fact, that for a long season the convocation of York has not transacted any business. But this synod is

just as competent to act now as formerly, or as that of the other province. And surely the Church of Ireland may act for itself, and meet in its own convocation. The Church of Ireland has various offices in constant use, having been sanctioned by convocation, which have no authority in England. To act in its own convocation would be no infringement on the part of the Irish Church of the Act of Union; nor can the objectors be in earnest in putting forth such a pretence. Neither can any argument be derived from the state of the colonial Church against the action of convocation in England. An answer to such an objection is supplied by the extract from Tenison's will, already quoted. He saw no difficulty in the case, but imagined that when the bishops and clergy were established, synodal action was necessary in the colonies as well as in the mother country. It would be impossible to have the attendance of the colonial bishops and representatives of the clergy in our own synods, in consequence of their distance; but it will be easy for convocation to devise measures to meet the case, and to enable every diocese to act synodically. As it is competent for convocation to advise the crown in the establishment of bishoprics in our colonies, so would it be equally within their province to submit to her majesty some plan for synodical action in all distant dioceses. Each bishop may assemble his diocesan synod, by whom the wants and wishes of the diocese may be ascertained; and their decisions or representations may be submitted to the convocations of Canterbury and York, united, as they sometimes would be, in a national council. The colonial Churches will never desire independence as long as the colonies depend on the British crown. At all events, whatever difficulties might arise in devising a plan for the colonies, it is most unreasonable to object on such a ground to the revival of convocation at home. The colonial Church, indeed, supplies one of the strongest arguments in favour of synodical action; for the questions connected with the extention and government of our Church

in our distant provinces are just those which can only be properly settled in a convocation.[t]

The question of the admission of the laity is also alleged as another difficulty in the way of synodical action. But this again is one of the matters which would fall under the consideration of the synod, and which could only be settled after much discussion and various meetings. This subject was long since considered by the men who were engaged in the controversy at the commencement of the last century. They were fully alive to the subject. "Let the presbyters, then, let the deacons, nay let the people too enjoy any liberty that either the ancient Church allowed them, or the interests of the present shall make it reasonable to indulge them. Let them come not only as witnesses of what is done in our synods, or to testifie their consent of the acts of them; but, if our governors please, let them define together with their bishops in them. Only let the divine right and prerogatives of the episcopacy be preserved, which our fathers have taken care, with so much zeal and piety, to support; and let the presbyters, as well as the deacons and people, remember this; that 'tis to the bishops, not to them, that the government of the Church was left by Christ and his apostles; and that 'tis one thing to be admitted into a share of it, and another to lay claim to it as a privilege which of right belongs to them."[u]

The same answer may be given to those who allege the different modes of electing proctors in different dioceses. All such questions would be settled in convocation; and it

[t] The vicar-general has decided that the Bishop of Cape Town, and of course all other colonial bishops, cannot be summoned to the convocation as suffragans of the Archbishop of Canterbury. This decision at once disposes of the objection of those persons who have dwelt so much on the difficulty of acting in convocation without the colonial prelates. It even strengthens the argument for bringing the convocation into action, inasmuch as some measures should be devised to meet the case.

[u] Wake's State, 118.

is extremely unfair to raise objections on such grounds, since those matters could be easily arranged, inasmuch as they do not affect the constitution of the synod. It is difficult to suppose that the men who raise such objections are serious. Let the synod meet, and these alleged difficulties will be disposed of with the utmost ease.

No one can, no one does deny, that the present state of matters is very unsatisfactory. "That the existing state of things is in these respects neither creditable nor safe in the Church, but is pregnant with scandal and danger—a scandal and a danger which are daily augmenting—has long been, as you are well aware, my own conviction."[v] The same writer, in his speech in the House of Lords on the presentation of a petition, observes, that he "did not wish such a close restraint as that no difference, even in material points, should be allowed; but it was most important that those points which were to be left at large should be understood to be left at large. Beyond all question some points required to be determined decisively."[w] The following passage contains an argument which can never be met by mere predictions of evils; and yet the only attempt at argument in opposing convocation consists of such predictions. "Those who discountenance the opinions entertained by the petitioners were wont to speak of the wisdom of our ancestors—a principle which he could tolerate even to something of an extreme, if accompanied by consistency; but when it was well known that our ancestors had instituted a certain form of Church government consisting of its members, and that no such thing had been permitted to operate for more than a century, it was intolerable inconsistency to allude to the wisdom of our ancestors as an excuse for departing from their practice, and contravening their intentions. Such persons cannot, I think, perceive that the very same arguments would apply equally in civil affairs; and yet it would be thought ridi-

[v] A Charge, &c. by the Archbishop of Dublin, pp. 22, 23.
[w] Ib. appendix, 28.

culous for any one to say, that though parliaments are a very beneficial institution, he deprecates the assembling of a parliament just now, because there is so much political excitement in the country, and the hostile parties are so violently opposed, that it is to be feared there would be a very stormy session. Certain it is, that in all cases of this kind we must expect to meet with the cry of 'not now,' on occasions of the most opposite character. When men's minds are in an excited and unsettled state, we are told 'not now,' wait for a period of greater tranquillity; when a lull takes place, and there is as little of discontent and party animosity as one can ever hope to find, again the cry is 'not now;' why unsettle men's minds? why not leave well alone?"[x]

Undoubtedly nothing will ever be accomplished if we are to sit still until no one can be found to raise objections, or until the clergy are united in opinion on every subject. This is well known by the objectors, who make use of an argument, derived from our divisions, against the action of convocation altogether. All the objections of the opponents of convocation may be reduced to one, namely, the apprehension of danger. But is it right that the fears of a comparatively small body of the clergy should be permitted to operate so as to prevent the Church from enjoying her representative assembly, especially when it is borne in mind, that the checks, which the law interposes, are sufficient to counteract any evil, in case the convocation should so far forget its duties and the interests of the community, as to attempt to carry measures, which must prove detrimental to the interests of religion? But supposing the worst fears of the opponents of convocation to be realised, and a majority should decide on alterations in the doctrines and practices of the Church, a remedy would be at hand, for the crown would interpose by a prorogation; and the odium of stopping the working of

[x] A Charge, &c. by the Archbishop of Dublin, pp. 30, 33, 34.

the synod would fall upon the clergy, who would be regarded as impracticable men. No canons, or laws, or rules, can be enacted without a royal license; all enactments must be carried in both houses; and even then they cannot take effect without the sanction of the crown. The strongest opponents of convocation can have no real fears, since the crown would never give its sanction to measures which would be obnoxious to parliament and the country. No evil could ensue from any enactments in convocation, even supposing the worst, that changes might be carried by both houses, which no one can really believe to be probable, unless the sovereign herself should wish to adopt measures injurious to the best interests of the Church; and in that case the country would interfere through the legislature. It follows, therefore, that the apprehensions of opponents can only refer to discussions and differences of opinion in debates; but mere predictions of evils ought not to be regarded as realities; nor are they deserving of any consideration in the face of those checks which the law interposes, and which would most effectually prevent any mischief, even supposing that it was intended by a majority in both houses.[y]

It is a common practice to refer to the disputes in the reigns of Queen Anne and George I. as an argument against the revival of convocation; the individuals who allege them forgetting or overlooking the circumstances which caused those divisions, and which were political, not ecclesiastical. Yet the period in question furnishes an argument against the very men who refer to it, since

[y] "By the statute the king's vote is asserted, and a negative vote restored, and himself made as well head of the convocation as the Church. Nothing can pass there without his concurrence, nor come to the consideration of the parliament without his pleasure; and thus the king hath a double vote in every Church ordinance; one is in the parliament, to pass the same as an act of parliament; the other as a member of convocation, to pass their advices to the parliament." Historical and Political Discourse of the Laws and Government of England; collected from the Manuscript Notes of John Selden, by Nathaniel Bacon: London, 1689, folio, part ii. p. 134.

the proceedings of those times shew, that if evil should be apprehended, the crown could interpose its authority and silence the convocation. But the causes which led to those disputes no longer exist. The clergy were then divided into two parties; the one anxious to make changes, to comprehend the Dissenters within the pale of the Church, the other fearful lest their best interests should be sacrificed to the principle of latitudinarianism. The fact is indisputable. Hence the disagreements between the two houses. On religious and purely Church questions, apart from political considerations, the upper and the lower house were not at issue; nor would the question of privileges and rights ever have been raised, if the causes already mentioned had not existed. To allege the proceedings of that period, therefore, as a reason for preventing the action of convocation in the present day, indicates a want of information or of candour. It is evident from the objections, which from time to time are put forth, that many of the opponents of synods are unacquainted with the real history of the divisions of the last century. When it is alleged, as is sometimes the case, that the aim of convocation was to exalt the power of the bishops, it is clear that the objectors speak at random and without due inquiry; since it is a fact that the struggle, on the part of the lower house, where alone any divisions existed, was an attempt to advance their own powers and to abridge those of the prelates, whom they regarded as men of lax opinions in matters connected with the discipline and government of the Church. A candid and patient examination of the subject would soon silence all objections of this character. It may be observed also, that to prevent the convocation in the present day from acting, in consequence of the divisions in the reigns of Queen Anne and George I., would be a visiting the errors of the men of that age on the clergy of the present; a proceeding which no one could justify.

Among the means used to excite our alarms respecting

the revival of convocation, is that of attempting to draw a parallel between an election of members for the imperial parliament and of proctors for the synod. It might be supposed that such an argument cannot be gravely used, since the circumstances in the two cases are so widely dissimilar. In every town, village, and hamlet throughout the country, persons are resident who possess a political vote, so that the whole nation becomes excited when a new parliament is summoned; but, on the other hand, only one person in each parish is concerned in the election of proctors, and that one individual is the clergyman, who, in nine cases out of ten, would exercise his privilege without the knowledge of his parishioners, and most assuredly without consulting them on the subject. How then can the parallel hold good?

Nor are the apprehensions of divisions among the members when assembled likely to be realised. The deans and archdeacons are ex-officio members, the former being appointed by the crown, the latter by the bishops. Thus the influence of the crown and the bishops must be felt in the lower house. Of the proctors, some are returned by the chapters of cathedrals, the rest by the parochial clergy. Extreme men would not be likely to be chosen by either body.

It is a singular fact, and one not to be passed over in this controversy, that, within the last twenty years, some persons called for a convocation who are now vehement opponents of its revival. To what cause is this change to be attributed? Did they, when they talked of a convocation, imagine that they should be able quietly to carry such alterations in the Book of Common Prayer as they themselves might desire, while the rest of the clergy would either have yielded to their demands, or have remained indifferent on the subject?[z] Certainly it would be unreason-

[z] The following argument, used, on the accession of James I., against the ministers who were so anxious for changes, is as applicable now to those who may desire alterations. "*That diverse of them have formerly subscribed*

able for men who profess to love the Church, and who some years since advocated the revival of convocation, to pretend a change of opinion because others as well as themselves are anxious on the subject. No member of the Church of England, who understands her constitution and is anxious to preserve it, can deny that our position, without a convocation, in which alone she can authoritatively speak, is most anomalous. Is this anomaly to be perpetuated; or is the time approaching when all sincere members of the Church of England, who are anxious to preserve her in her integrity, to promote her efficiency, and to advance her best interests among a population already divided into numerous sects, shall agree to merge their differences on many matters, which have been discussed during the last few years, in one common desire for the general good? May such a feeling be manifested by all orders of the clergy; and may our Church prosper, not only in our own country, but in every part of the world!

to the booke (as scornfully they tearme it), doth manifestly evince that either our leiturgy is justifiable, themselves being judges, or els that they did liberally dispence with their own consciences, which is not the parte of honest men. To do *that in respect of the times* which in itselfe is not lawful, proveth little lesse than hypocrisie." The Answere of the Vice-chancellor, &c. &c. p. 10. To the objections about the length of the service the Oxford men reply: "Their desire to *have the longsomeness of service abridged* doth well befit their great devotion; who notwithstanding are wont to spende an houre sometimes, or little lesse, in extemporarie, inconsequent, and senselesse praiers, conceived rashly by themselves. From hence, their dislike of set and stinted formes of praier, it doth proceede that some of them omit, some refuse to repeate, some condemne the use of the Lord's Praier." Ib. 12.

THE END.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY LEVEY, ROBSON, AND FRANKLYN,
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

By the same Author.

A HISTORY OF THE NONJURORS,

THEIR CONTROVERSIES AND WRITINGS, &c.

8vo, 14*s.*

MEMORIALS OF ERNEST THE PIOUS,

THE ANCESTOR OF PRINCE ALBERT.

Post 8vo, 5*s.*

HISTORY OF THE SPANISH ARMADA.

Post 8vo, 3*s.*

A HISTORY OF THE GUNPOWDER TREASON.

Second Edition, post 8vo, 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE REVIVAL OF THE ORDER OF SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS.

1*s.*

THE NATIONAL CHURCH

THE BEST MEDIUM OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

6*d.*

PROTESTANTISM THE OLD RELIGION, POPERY THE NEW.

Twelfth Thousand. 3*d.*

Shortly will be published,

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

PREVIOUS TO THE REFORMATION.

8vo.

In this work will be detailed the particulars connected with the introduction of Christianity into Britain — the struggles of the British and Saxon Church against the usurpation of Rome — the means by which that usurpation was at last completed, with its rejection at the Reformation, when the Church was restored to its primitive state in doctrine and practice. It will be proved that the Reformation was not the erection of a new system, but a renunciation of views and practices which were alike opposed to the Word of God and the first four centuries ; and that the doctrines of the English Church are those of the sacred volume, while its rites and ceremonies are in strict conformity with the primitive ages.

Date Due

FACULTY
JUN 10 '58
JUN 18 '58
2 weeks

BW5015.2.L35
A history of the convocation of the
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00037 4647